The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

THE compilers of the B.B.C. bulletins would do well to exercise a little more thought before they give the enemy ground to scoff and home listeners opportunity to blaspheme. It is surprising how often enemy machines have been too high to bomb definite objectives at the beginning of the news and deliberately bombing hospitals and churches at the end! And our rulers would do well to limit the number of times they announce that "damage was inconsiderable in view of the forces employed"; true as this may be viewed in the light of the country's defence, it only serves to irritate those who have lost their homes and all they possess. The maintenance of perspective can be secured in better ways than by the constant repetition of such announcements. Our Prime Minister, too, in his search for heartening phrases, would do well to avoid references to "a grand life". His acceptance of this phrase as a slogan has been one of his slips, almost as bad as the descent from the post of national leader in time of crisis to become leader of a political Party. Let the Prime Minister get on with his job, and not bother about Parties; the sooner he is through with it the happier the people will be, for assuredly they do *not* find this a "grand life". Mr. Churchill has at the moment the backing of people of all Parties and classes; that is because they expect him to get things done. He has the chance for which he has been looking for half-a-lifetime, and he must not throw it away. Let him "go to it"!

* * *

WHAT will the temper of the British people be when the war is ended? What that of British Christians? Mr. Harold Nicolson has said that at Versailles there should have been either a peace of force or a peace of justice. Instead, the peace

> was unjust enough to cause resentment, but not forceful enough to render such resentment impotent. Germany was neither conciliated nor suppressed. She was wounded, but not slain.

What of the peace of 194—? Is Britain going to say "Never again" and attempt to deprive Germany of the impossibility of committing any further aggression? There is certain to be a tremendous demand for such action, and people will not be in the mood to ask how long such repression could be maintained. There-

fore it is well, even though we do not know when the war will end, or what the state of Europe will be, to think and talk and endeavour to secure that reason and not passion may prevail.

And, no matter how unpopular it may be, we must proclaim, in season and out of season, that sacrifice will be necessary all round if permanent peace is to be secured. Everywhere there must be limitation of national sovereignty, and the stupidities of disarmament conferences where each delegation strives to cut down weapons to which it is specially vulnerable and to retain those which are specially valuable to itself must be banished. And from this point of view the United States may be reminded of Dr. Charles Seymour's words about the last Peace:

> We sacrificed little in announcing that we would take no territory (which we did not want) nor reparations (which we could not collect). Our interest lay in assuring a *régime* of world tranquillity; our geographic position was such that we could advocate disarmament and arbitration with complete safety.

Nations, as individuals, must sacrifice if a great boon like the peace of mankind is to be obtained.

* * *

From an American correspondent, Nov. 14th:

> June we saw France fall, England doomed. July we hoped against hope England could hold on. August we were amazed she was [holding on]. September we woke up to realize she was taking the beating and had the morale to take it. October we drew a deep breath, and November we think she can win. There is no doubt now of full American support—up to war. The issue now is not shall we help Britain, but shall we declare war or not. And so time goes.

* * *

This is no place to answer queries about the course of the war, even if we were qualified and had the necessary information to do so. Last quarter we spoke of the general expectancy that the Italian Navy would be attacked immediately Italy entered the War, and asked why Rhodes and the Dodecanese Islands had not been seized. Since then the Italian Navy has suffered heavy losses, and the surprising successes of the Greek Army have enabled the R.A.F. to make good use of the bases provided by the entry of Greece into the War. The Greek successes, if they can be held, will probably prove decisive for Egypt, Turkey, and even some of the Balkan States. It would not be surprising if a German invasion of Italy were to take place ere many weeks have passed; there is no love lost between Germans and Italians, and Hitler would have no more regard for promises made to allies and friends than for those made to neutrals. And as his army remains intact and probably

running to seed, he would no doubt be glad of some safe place to use it.

Meanwhile the British problem is two-fold—the night bomber and the attack on shipping. It is a pity that people were encouraged to believe that the solution of the first was at hand, and that they were not made to realize earlier the tremendous advantage given to enemy submarines by the possession of French and other ports.

We have always held that the weeks round the shortest day would be also the darkest in the war; by the spring we hope there will be a distinct turn for the better.

Despite their sufferings the people are amazingly brave and cheerful. No praise is too high for their indomitable courage and grit.

* * *

SOMETIMES with bewilderment, but often with heroism, the churches are carrying on their work. Last winter black-out, evacuation, the absence of young men in the Services and the acceptance by old men and by women of various forms of war activity, presented problems that had to be solved, and difficult indeed they seemed. In some parts of the country they still are regarded as serious, but where churches are demolished or unusable, or where practically all the congregation has disappeared, they have suddenly become insignificant. It is not always easy on leaving London, with its hundred damaged Congregational Churches, or having stood amid the ruins of Above Bar or Freemantle in Southampton, or surveyed the demolition at Coventry, to accommodate one's self to a state of mind where a congregation cannot agree what should be done if an "Alert" sounds!

The sympathy of the whole denomination has gone out to ministers and people whose buildings have been demolished. Often these pages have spoken of the tyranny of church buildings, but we know full well how dear the very stones of the sanctuary where one has regularly worshipped become with the passing years. And when individuals have lost home and business as well as church, words are all too poor to express sympathy, and thoughts are too deep even for tears. Through the Emergency Fund and in other ways, the churches are proving that we are members one of another, but co-operation and fellowship are limited by no denominational boundaries; as we gazed on the ruins of his church a Southampton clergyman said the other day, "We are being bombed together; my people are using a room in the Congregational Church". It is to be hoped that after the war this co-operation in service and worship will be continued. Occasionally people have been heard to speak as if, when the time came, their church and all other churches would be rebuilt exactly on the old lines. It would be as well if they were disabused of this idea

right now; there will not be an abundant supply of money, and surely the long-desired opportunity for planning the resources of Christendom in each area will be seized, even though it has been provided in such tragic fashion. It should be possible for community churches to be formed in some areas—they have been successful in many parts of the United States—where people of all denominations can work and worship together; if to those churches a full ministerial staff can be attached, men and women qualified along special lines for pastoral, religious educational, and youth work, all the better. But let us rid ourselves at once of the idea that after this upheaval we are returning to the same old ruts and the same old ways. And with their *ethos* the Congregational churches should lead the way in all forms of experiment.

We are yet, however, a long way from the day when we can replan our ruined cities and demolished churches, and before that time comes there will be many shocks. One of them we expected would be the terms of the War Damage Compulsory Insurance Scheme, for we feared that heavy premiums might prove the last straw for churches with unusable buildings, or in districts so denuded of people or with adherents so financially crippled, that already they find it impossible to meet overhead charges. That blow has not fallen; churches are, apparently, to receive *some* compensation for damage, but at the moment more questions can be asked about this than can be answered. When will compensation be paid? Who will determine its amount? If a secular authority is to have the last word on which churches are to be rebuilt, and how and where, there will be some pretty problems. However, there are pressing difficulties enough today, and we shall do well to leave tomorrow's until tomorrow. Only we must sleep with one eye open, lest we wake one morning to find a Dictator of Religion in the saddle, shouting, "Baptists to the left; Congregationalists to the right; Methodist Central Hall in the middle; High Church here; Low Church there"—yes, there may be some *very* pretty problems!

* * *

Some fine service is being rendered by ministers and members of damaged churches to the communities where they are placed; indeed in some boroughs when the public services seemed to break down at critical moments, it is acknowledged that clergy and ministers stepped into the breach in magnificent fashion. In air-raid shelters and for homeless and friendless people ministers of religion are spending themselves without stint. Some of the work they are doing we hope will be described in our next issue. The London Congregational ministers met recently and pooled their experiences, and their complaints and suggestions were brought to the notice of the Minister of Home Security, by whom they were welcomed. In

London the problem is to lift all the local authorities to the level of the best. It can be assumed that the Minister highly values the services the churches are rendering in helping men, women, and children in shelters and temporarily homeless; cases where their help has been spurned by local persons drest in a little brief authority—and there are such on record—should be brought to his notice.

* * *

Our comments on the crude ideas of prayer which always find expression in days of crisis have caused discussion in the press in many parts of the country. The subject of prayer and providence is discussed in a thoughtful little book, Canon F. R. Barry's *Faith in Dark Ages* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.). He speaks of the "fateful sequences" of last spring—the National Day of Prayer, the Belgian surrender, the "miracle" of Dunkirk, the Day of Thanksgiving, the Day of Prayer for France, and the capitulation of the Bordeaux Government—and calls them "a warning that such *ad hoc* days of prayer are dangerous methods". That does not mean that Canon Barry does not believe in prayer, and he goes on to make some wise observations. We quote one of them:

> If the Christian religion is not a complete mistake, we are bound to believe that it is the will of God that Justice and Truth, Freedom and Compassion should not be overwhelmed by the forces of barbarism, cruelty and terror. God cannot be indifferent to the issue. A living God, as Lord Balfour said, "takes sides". "Thou shalt take the matter into thine hand: the poor committeth himself unto thee for thou art the helper of the friendless." We could not go on if we did not believe that. However unworthy we may rightly think ourselves to be used as instruments of God's purpose—and there is no more dangerous belief—yet we are upheld by the conviction that this war runs back into the eternal order, into the conflict between Right and Wrong. And the will of God, we are sure, must be engaged in it. We cannot believe that it is His will that the world should be overrun by the power of evil. His "name", His honour seem to be at stake. ("Help us and deliver us for thy name's sake.") So the Bible frequently declares. It was not, it says, for the deserts of Israel, not for their reward or their comfort, that the Lord wrought His acts of deliverance. "It was for mine own name's sake that I did it", lest the world should say the Lord cannot save.

* * *

The view expounded last quarter that the Dominion of Canada is destined to play a most important part in the history of the world in the next half-century has been amply confirmed in the interval: as the link between Britain and the United States—between the British Empire and the United States—she is indeed in a crucial

position. And yet how little do folk in the home-country know about her: ignorance of her size, her resources, her politics, her religion, is so abysmal as to be fantastic. How many even of those who count themselves educated are aware that the 48 United States could all be comfortably accommodated on Canadian soil, or that the Dominion's resources in a vast expanse of land and sea are boundless? How few of those who are aware of the problem presented by a large French-speaking community know anything of the peculiar situation of the weak central government over against powerful and wealthy Provinces, or of the presence in some of the great cities of large European and oriental populations?

Or, to come a little nearer home, how many Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists in this country can speak with assurance about the success or otherwise of that union of Churches in Canada in which the three denominations have shared? It is humiliating to realize how little we know of our kith and kin, and of our co-religionists, and it is greatly to be desired that leaders of the Churches in Great Britain will at once establish closer relations with the Canadian Churches. Congregationalists in England and Scotland would do well to secure a constant interchange of ministers—and of laymen—with those of the United Church of Canada. And why should not every Congregational church at home maintain a fraternal correspondence with a church in Canada?

Meanwhile we would strongly recommend to our readers Prof. Stephen Leacock's *Our British Empire* (Lane, 7s. 6d.). Mr. Leacock could not fail to be entertaining, and he has contrived to enclose a pill of information in a good deal of jam very skilfully indeed. Those who want the facts only will find them in the valuable "Table" at the end of the book, but we advise them to read all the preceding pages, where they will find many suggestions for the future which will give them food for thought—that about "Empire Finance", for instance. Or take this paragraph, which, we suspect, will give rise to furious controversy:

> The broad basis of migration as I see it, lies thus. It must aim first and foremost at bringing British people; French, too, if they would come. But they won't. They prefer to stay at home on the boulevards, read the sixth edition of the evening paper over a "bock", and wait for the next war. Scandinavian, too, in any amount. Because we can turn a Scandinavian into a Canadian so fast that he doesn't know what's happened to him. Before he knows it, he's in the Saskatchewan legislature, talking English. In any case there are not enough Scandinavians all put together, to swamp us. But for continental Europe we should go slow, and for some areas, shut out their people as we would a bubonic plague. For all the Orient the only policy is and must be exclusion. Where we

cannot marry, where we cannot worship, where we cannot eat, there we cannot live. The Eastern and Western races cannot unite. Biologists tell us that where they intermarry their progeny is an ill-joined product, two brains rattling in one skull. Nor could we institute in the Empire, certainly not in the temperate Dominions, a servile class, a race of coolies. All the old empires based on that have crumbled with Nineveh and Tyre—and the new ones will go down in earthquake. It has been claimed that perhaps, in the part of Australia too hot for white labour, the settlement of people of a less sensitive race—in families, as free people but under control—might be hazarded. As such immigrants we could not let in people like the Japanese with an imperial home power behind them. That would mean an open gate for war. But we might let in the meeker and homeless people—the negroes who have learned humility in centuries of adversity. The meek, it is said, will inherit the earth. Long-time vision shows already how it may happen.

Here are one or two illustrations of the economic pill in the humorist's jam:

Hence the statistics of the older continents, beginning with clarity and certainty in France, grow dim as they move east till they vanish in a mist in Russia, in a fog in Siberia, and midnight in devastated China.

We could no more eat all our own wheat than the Swiss can consume all their own scenery.

There is an old rhyme from somewhere which is called "the lawyer's lullaby", and which runs. "Be still my child, remain in *status quo*, while father rock's the cradle to and fro". That suits the case exactly.

* * *

PACIFISM has been fortunate in possessing a champion with the learning, the incisiveness, and the pertinacity of Dr. C. J. Cadoux, who has placed all Christians—and not only pacifists—in his debt by a careful reconsideration of the whole question, now published as *Christian Pacifism re-examined* (Blackwell, 12s. 6d.). The Christian Church is sorely torn asunder on this issue; all the denominations have strong pacifist groups, and in some parts of the country the tension between ministers and people has become so great that resignations have taken place. This is unfortunate and, we cannot but think, totally unnecessary. Of course there are places where pacifism has only been the occasion of a cessation of a ministry which had already become unfruitful; but there are others where minister and congregation have failed to handle the situation with the charity, tolerance, and commonsense which should mark all Christ's people — and not least Congregational churches. Where a man is secure in the affection of his flock and tactful in the presentation of his message, he will be given full

freedom of utterance even where most of his hearers do not accept his teaching. A notable recent instance in the United Church of Canada is deserving of both record and emulation. A highly respected minister felt constrained to declare his pacifist views. His congregation met and passed a resolution dissociating themselves from his teaching, whereupon he resigned. The congregation then immediately called him to the pastorate, and he accepted. Conscience was satisfied all round.

But this has taken us from Dr. Cadoux's book, which we recommend to all our readers, for they will find in it the problem surveyed in all—or nearly all—its aspects. The examination has not caused Dr. Cadoux to revise his pacifist convictions; he still finds himself

> debarred from participation in fighting by the un-Christian character of the operation itself and by my acquaintance with a better and positive method of tackling the world's evil.

Nevertheless he finds himself able to present a "relative justification for war" (Ch. VI on "The Bearing of Ethical Relativity on the Problem" is exceptionally good, and so is the discussion of what service the conscientious pacifist can undertake in wartime).

Dr. Cadoux sets out to hold the balance even and to present the arguments for both sides. With his strong bias he could scarcely expect to succeed. What would he have said, we wonder, had he been reviewing a book in which the author's authority was "I have seen it stated in print" (p. 30)? Round numbers, too, are always suspicious: what is the evidence that "a million women and children in Central Europe died of starvation as a result of the British blockade"? Superlatives are even more suspect, and we doubt if black troops in the Rhineland "needlessly ruined . . . the purity and happiness of *countless* German homes". There may be more to be said for the contention that the Great War resulted in a "widespread drop in the standard of sexual purity"; but increased sexual frankness in word and deed does not necessarily imply a moral descent, nor must it all be attributed to war.

No one, however, will work through this searching analysis without benefit and a feeling of gratitude to its writer for his candid and thorough treatment of the subject (but why does he not mention by name "eminent scholars"—like Sir Alfred Zimmern—with whom he disagrees?).

The tragedy of the last twenty years is that pacifist and non-pacifist Christians have wasted so much energy in fighting each other instead of beating out short-term and long-term policies for the destruction of war on which all could agree. We are glad that Dr. Cadoux does not overlook the claim that for some Christians pacifism may be a vocation: the strictures of the Dean of St. Paul's on the two Archbishops for recognizing such a possibility seem

beside the mark. We wonder if Dr. Cadoux sufficiently recognizes that, even if it be true that "active Christian love which makes no use of injurious violence is on a long view a more effective weapon for dealing with human wrong-doing than is any method involving bloodshed", on occasions there is not time to adopt "a better and more positive method of tackling the world's evil"; the bully is there, and in action; the immediate need is one to the point and another to the solar plexus—for his sake, for the sake of the victims, and for the sake of the community: drastic, it may be, and negative and un-Christian, but at the moment the only possible method.

We wish Dr. Cadoux had expanded and developed his claim that

> the Cross of Christ, seen in the light of centuries of Christian experience, gives proof of the strange power of such love to succeed through apparent failure; and unlike the method of war, which has to be eternally repeated (since every war produces the seeds of another war to follow), it has the virtue of setting in motion a process of permanent healing.

Every sentence in this quotation would be challenged by non-Christians, and many Christians would find themselves hard put to it to expound them.

Perhaps the most puzzling feature of the pacifist attitude today —and it is perhaps especially obvious to those who, with much agony of mind, have had to relinquish their pacifism—is the failure of so many pacifists to find for themselves any service and sacrifice comparable with that of those serving in the Forces. Here we have not in mind youthful conscientious objectors, many of whom do begin their tribunal statements—and rightly—with an expression of their readiness to live on soldiers' pay. (Not that the inactivity of youths in reserved occupations does not puzzle us: during the long vacation we expected an invasion of coastal towns by theological students who desired, even while serving the churches, to share the perils of their contemporaries—but their presence was not conspicuous. A reader of these words retorts that nobody made the suggestion to the students, that had the idea occurred to them they would no doubt have been glad to go to the coast. That is precisely our trouble—that the idea did not occur to them, and suggestion from outside be needed.) Rather do we think of older men who seem to be content to carry on precisely as if there were no war, without sharing in the extra burden resting on mankind. Some ministers, we know, have expressed a willingness to go to coastal towns or to London to relieve their brethren for a period, but to others passionately devoted to pacifism the frequent question of the Tribunal chairman may legitimately be put, "In what way is your life different from what it was when the war broke out?"

It is when pacifists *go out of their way* to share the risks and perils of others and are seen to be carrying even more than their share of the additional sufferings entailed by war that their views will begin to carry conviction. Pascal's words come to mind: *"Je ne crois que les histoires dont les témoins se feraient égorger"*.

This is one of the points Dr. John Lewis makes in his very able *The Case Against Pacifism* (Allen & Unwin, 5s. & 2s. 6d.), where he answers the pacifist's words, "We can at any rate refuse to fight and carry on with our own way of life", in the words,

> Even, presumably, if our freedom is taken from us and our weaker brethren are made into the helpless robots of a servile State; even if nations like Abyssinia, Spain, Czechoslovakia, and China are absorbed by Fascist empires. Is it seriously and honestly expected by such people that the example of personal sanctity in a handful of pacifists is going to tame the tigers of class oppression and international aggression? Is it not simply the old cry of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

It is rather a pity Dr. Lewis spends so much time in lauding Russia, not only because events have so far outrun his argument as to make some of his pages rather absurd, but this section weakens the chapters which precede. Here is a contention which, it seems to us, pacifists are failing to meet:

> Miss Macaulay expresses horror at a dispute being settled by murder, cruelty, bombing, and poison gas. I entirely agree. That is the method chosen by the law-breaker. What is Miss Macaulay going to do about it? Is she going to let him settle it by these cruel and irrational methods, or is she going to prevent him? If you do not prevent him—and only force can prevent him—then you allow him, and if you state in advance that you do not intend to prevent him, then you definitely encourage him—and both these things are what Miss Macaulay has chosen to do.

Or, as someone has said, "If I were Hitler I should pray for the success of the Peace Pledge movement". Is it not plain that the refusal to get mixed up with violence has encouraged and does encourage aggression?

Dr. Lewis believes that men will not believe in any great numbers that peace can be assured merely by allowing injustice on all occasions to go by default. He also effectively answers Professor G. H. C. Macgregor's words, *"It is impossible to believe that God will ever face the wholly consecrated Christian with a dilemma in which there is only a choice of two evils"*. Such a choice, he contends, must often be made—

> the choice is never between rigid obedience to the moral law and wilful transgression, but, as we have seen, between two courses both of which have evil consequences either immediate or remote.

And to the frequent claim that refusal to act is "the acceptance of a cross", he replies,

> The *obligation to choose* is indeed a cross; the *refusal to choose*, however, in such a hard case is really not the acceptance of a cross, but a dereliction of duty.

And here is another sentence which gives food for thought:

> Pacifism flourishes behind the lines, far from the battle front or in periods of intense sophistication and morbid introspection, as in Russia before the revolution. It is essentially a phenomenon characteristic of the middle-class intellectual or religious devotee who is alienated from realities and lost in a fictitious world of ideas.

The War and Christian Ethics (Blackwell, 6s.), a symposium to which twelve writers contribute, contains three admirable essays which, among other things, give a much-needed warning against over-simplification of the problem on one side or the other. They are Canon Cockin's "The Judgment of God", Prof. Farmer's "The 'Good' and the 'Right' ", and Principal Lofthouse's "The New Testament Ideal".

* * *

Even in war-time the Board of Education is one of the most important ministries, but not even in peace-time would anyone ever think so. Prime Ministers never seem to ask whether the President appointed should have any special aptitude for his office; the only considerations seem to be political. So it comes about that during forty years we have seen twenty Presidents of the Board, and most of them were as little educationalists at the end of their terms of office as at the beginning. Is it not possible to take education entirely outside the party field, and appoint the best man for the job no matter what his party may be? As long as education is the sport of politicians, so long shall we fail to get the educated nation which is supposed to be our aim.

* * *

These pages have frequently deplored the tendency of the modern pulpit to employ a technical language which is a foreign tongue to nine-tenths of those who sit in the pews. "We preachers", said Roger Ascham, "ought to think like great men, but speak like common people"; most preachers seem to find it as hard to carry out the second injunction as the first. In Father Gerald Vann's admirable study of Thomas Aquinas we notice that he claims for his hero that one of the things he set out to do at Paris was to "talk the idiom of his time": Father Vann himself, however, speaks of Thomas's opponents as "susurrating in corners"—susurrating!!

We have emphasized ere this how the words of Jesus in the English Bible are words of one syllable, or at most two—words

that live for ever, just as their burden never dies:

> I am the light of the world.
> A city set on a hill cannot be hid.
> Ye are the salt of the earth.
> A certain man had two sons.
> But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee.

In his essay belabouring the modern critics of Milton, Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith shows how, in moments of solemnity and crisis, the poet's words are short:

> So clomb this first grand Thief into Gods Fould.
> She pluck'd, she eat:
> Earth felt the wound, and Nature from her seat
> Sighing through all her Works gave signs of woe,
> That all was lost.

And, of course, it is not merely in its language that the pulpit fails to find contact with the man in the pew: often the whole subject-matter is theoretical, academic, and aloof from life. In these days when men and women are living 'mid tragedy and tears, there is no place in the pulpit for theological disquisitions or the discussion of nice problems of biblical introduction, no matter how fascinating they may be to the student. Did not Sir Thomas More compare the verbal sophistries of his day to "the process of milking a he-goat into a sieve"?

* * *

Dissent has frequently been made the whipping-boy, but we had never realized that it was actually responsible for the defeat of Cambridge in the Boat Race of 1864! Sir William Hardman wrote (*Letters and Memoirs,* 2nd series, ed. S. M. Ellis, 1925):

> The University Boat Race came off on Saturday, and resulted in a tremendous licking for Cambridge: they were beaten by twelve boat lengths!! . . . My friend Dodson (M.P.) is vigorously endeavouring to pass a Bill for Abolition of Tests at Oxford through the House. If he succeeds, it will only place Oxford on the same footing as Cambridge, which is but fair. I attribute our recent defeats on the Thames to the admixture of Little Bethel—to the admission of Dissenters. The Physique of the University is thereby lowered, for who could reasonably expect that Salem, Ebenezer, or Bethesda could possibly produce anything worthy of being put in a University Eight. . . . Unbeliever as I am, I hate Dissenters!

* * *

It is a pity that some of our neo-Thomists so run Thomas Aquinas to death that their hearers determine to leave him dead, and let him trouble them no more—a pity because most Free Churchmen

should know much more about him than they do. We commend to them an admirable little book by Father Gerald Vann—*St. Thomas Aquinas* (Dent, 6s.)—which we should like to think all ministers would read during the Christmas holidays. The author is an enthusiast, but his enthusiasm does not lead to rodomontade: he sees St. Thomas as "the one man in all history, among all the geniuses of east and west, in whom the truth, the complete truth, is to be found"; he is "the mouthpiece for universal, not provincial, truth", and thus constructs a philosophy valid for both east and west, which synthesizes their thought. Readers might study Father Vann's outline, and decide for themselves whether his claims for his hero are true, and whether Thomas did really achieve the harmony of faith and reason.

So total is the average man's ignorance of St. Thomas that we should like to see preachers attempting an address to make him known to their flocks. A setting is available for an introduction which would grip the people: St. Thomas could be pictured as a medieval Edgar Wallace, dictating to three or four secretaries on different subjects at the same time, and working himself out at 49, the age at which Silvester Horne's glowing career came to an end. His life-story could be outlined to introduce a discussion of Father Vann's claim that he was "fitted by nature, by birth, and by environment to achieve the metaphysical synthesis of which the world stood, and stands, in need".

The subject is so tempting that we are almost persuaded to reenter the pastorate in order to tackle it. For it is clear that the pulpit will have to begin again to preach theology; only it must be theology in popular terms, and if it can be given a historical or biographical background the way to the hearts and minds of hearers will be easier. A sermon which so outlined Thomas's contribution to theological learning that the young thinking Christian felt inclined to argue about it would be itself a contribution to the well-being of the Church; and it might even lead a group to discuss the truth of M. Gilson's dictum that Thomas had "two intellectual qualities, whose combination in the same mind is rather rare, a perfect intellectual modesty and an almost reckless intellectual audacity". Whether it be true or not, the Church today is sadly in need of men with this combination.

* * *

AGAIN there must be a note to say how splendidly the R.T.S. is doing its work. Our review pages from time to time deal with the scholarly works it issues through the Lutterworth Press. Small pamphlets dealing with the world situation from the Christian angle are frequent; and at this time of the year boys and girls are eagerly awaiting the Annuals and adventure and school stories. The *Boy's Own*, the *Girl's Own*, the *Schoolboy's*, the *Schoolgirl's*,

and *Little Dots* are backed by stories by well-known writers suitable for children of all ages. O to be young again!

* * *

FROM the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead's *This is the Victory* (Hodder, 5s.) we take the Hyde Park orator's retort to the heckler who cried, "Christianity has been in the world for two thousand years, and look at the state of the world"—"Yes, and water has been in the world for two million years, and look at the state of your face".

* * *

A LITTLE book worth its weight in radium is Prof. Irwin Edman's essay, *Candle in the Dark* (Cape, 2s. 6d.). We began to quote this "postscript to despair", but we found we were copying most of the essay. Here, however, are a few sentences to persuade readers to buy and give and lend:

> The science that was to make life beautiful has also made it hideous. It rains bombs upon defenceless cities as well as celestial music upon enraptured ears. It invents unspeakable tortures as well as the clean beauties of modern architecture. It brings the most elegant and disciplined of chamber music into our homes, but it carries thereto also the voices of the demagogue and the dictator. It gives us abundance, but has not prevented starvation in the midst of plenty. It gives us longer life—and swifter death. . . .

* * *

FROM Dr. Townley Lord's *Conquest of Death*, a book we strongly recommend:

> We are reminded of the motorist who, in the black-out, crashed into a telegraph pole, breaking it and bringing down the wires. When he recovered consciousness he was discovered clutching the telegraph wires and was heard to exclaim, "Thank heaven it's a harp!"

* * *

POSSIBLY many people have seen these lines on "The Joy of Being Editor":

> Getting out a magazine is no picnic.
> If we print jokes, people say we are silly;
> If we do not, they say we are too serious.
> If we clip things from other publications, we are too lazy to write them ourselves;
> If we do not, we are stuck on our own stuff.
> If we do not print contributions,
> We do not appreciate true genius;
> If we do print them, the magazine is filled with junk.
> If we make a change in another's write-up, we are too critical;
> If we do not, we are asleep.

Now, as likely as not, someone will say that
We swiped this from another writer.
WE DID!

With that introduction we can gleefully scrounge this cricket score, which first (?; we doubt everything these days) appeared in a South African newspaper, was seen there by an Australian reader of Dr. George Jackson's "A Parson's Log" in the *Methodist Recorder* and sent by him to Dr. Jackson (in Canada?), and was printed by him in the "Log". The runs are the number of days the batsmen held out.

P. O. Land, c Stalin, b Hitler	10
C. Slovakia, c and b Hitler	0
A. U. Stria, run out	0
D. Enmark, run out	0
N. Orway, c Quisling, b Hitler	62
H. Olland, retired hurt	3
B. Elgium, st Leopold, b Hitler	17
F. Rance, c Musso, b Hitler	294
G. Britain, not out	379
D. O. Minions, not out	379
A. Merica, to bat	
Tea interval, 8 wickets for	1,134

"STOP PRESS: Musso bowling from gasworks end."

We would add (Dec. 10):

Still later, 1314 for 8 (G. Britain 464 not, D. O. Minions 464 not).

* * *

COPIES of the Index for 1940 may be obtained on application to the publishers.

NEW COLLEGE, 1903—1933.

A CHAPTER IN ITS HISTORY

By Dr. A. E. Garvie.

New College bears, as a former Dean of King's College was pleased to say to me on several occasions, a lie in its name, as it is the oldest academic institution now included in the University of London, a fact I discovered to my surprise when I was given precedence at a dinner to the heads of colleges. It is the oldest Congregational College (if not Nonconformist, which the Baptist College, Bristol, claims to be). One of its Trusts, the Harmondsworth, dates from the year 1673. Its tributary streams were the King's Head Society, 1730-1817, the Homerton Academy, 1817-1823, Homerton College, 1823-1853, Northampton Academy, 1729-1751 and 1789-1799, Daventry Academy, 1752-1789, Wymondley Academy, 1799-1833, Coward College, 1833-1850, Hoxton Academy, 1778-1826, Highbury College, 1826-1850. Homerton, Highbury, and Coward Colleges united in 1850, and, as I suppose none would yield "pride of place" to the others, under the name New (why not Hampstead?). The Centenary will fall in 1950, and as I have had a personal connection for a third of that period, I am offering this contribution to its not inglorious history. My intimate association with New College was continued during thirty years, 1903-1933; but in order to round off the record properly I must begin this chapter in its history a few years earlier and close a few years later.

I.

The College during this period experienced changes, which seem to me to have been of sufficient interest and importance to justify an account of them by one with a fuller knowledge of them than any other person now living.

(1) The first event to be chronicled is the formation of the Theological Faculty of the University of London, and the inclusion in it of New College as one of the Divinity Schools:

> The Statutes of 1900, made by the Commissioners appointed under the London University Act of 1898, constituted eight Faculties in the University, of which Theology stands first. Seven Theological Colleges in or near London were named as the first Divinity "Schools" of the University, such of their teachers as should be recognised by the Senate becoming members of the Faculty. Two of the seven Schools were colleges of the Established Church (King's and St. John's Hall, Highbury), three Congregationalist (Hackney, New and

Cheshunt), one Wesleyan (Richmond), and one Baptist (Regent's Park)[1].

As this story unfolds, one after another will fall out, until now only four remain, the two Anglican, and New and Richmond. If in view of past differences between Anglicans and Nonconformists this seemed an adventure that was likely to fail, it has proved in fact a venture crowned with success. There has never been a division between Anglicans and Nonconformists, as in any differences both have shared. As the Dean of King's College was *ex officio* a member of the Senate, the Anglican members generously agreed that the Member elected by the Faculty should be chosen from the Nonconformist Colleges. Dr. Alfred Cave, Principal of Hackney College, was on his death succeeded by Dr. R. Vaughan Pryce, Principal of New College: both had co-operated with Dr. Robertson, Principal of King's College, in carrying through the organization of the Faculty. On Dr. Pryce's retirement, Dr. Bennett succeeded him, and on his removal to Manchester Dr. Andrews took his place. The present member of the Senate is Dr. Waterhouse (Richmond College). On two occasions I declined nomination as I knew that membership would make larger demands on my time than my other activities would allow.

As I have heard opinions expressed adverse to the connexion of our Colleges with a University, I wish very emphatically, after thirty years' experience of the Faculty and the Board of Theology, and of the Board of Philosophy—of which, as I taught a philosophical subject, I was also a member—to advocate such a connexion whenever it is practicable. The danger of the Churches is to be aloof from the thought and life of the world around; ministers run the risk of an intellectual isolation, and a professional separateness. It is well for students of theology to mix freely with students of other Faculties, to have a "University" and not merely a "Seminary" outlook, to be tested by competent examiners, not of their denomination, and to follow a curriculum of which scholars and thinkers of varied types share the shaping. The limitations imposed on the teachers is not an alien yoke, as they prescribe the Syllabus, but may prove a friendly rein on individual preferences. I for one was quite content to be guided by a Syllabus which left me as much freedom as I wanted. Further, if we believe that religion is man's supreme concern, and that theology is the queen of the sciences, we must desire that it should have a place in every University deserving the name, as a shrine for every type of knowledge. So intimate is the relation of theology to the religion of the Churches that it is imperative that the Faculty of Theology should not be detached from the Churches, as unfortunately it has

[1] *London Theological Studies* 1911. Introductory Note, Sketch of the History of the Faculty by S. W. Green, xiv.

been in Germany, but have an intimate relation with them. As Nonconformists, not in hostile rivalry but in amicable co-operation with Anglicans, we should welcome the opportunity of contributing our best thought to the common store of Christian witness at the Universities. I am confident that the standard of work for the London B.D. has raised the general standard even for the students who are not able to undertake the examinations.

(2) The New College Report for the Session 1901-2 records that during the session for the first time Joint Theological Classes of Hackney and New College students were conducted at New College in Old and New Testament, Philosophy, and Church History. Till then the co-operation of the two Colleges, in which Regent's Park College was also included, had been confined to teaching for the Matriculation, Intermediate B.A. and B.D., and B.A. degree of London University. This co-operation allowed of greater specialization by the Professors; *e.g.*, Prof. Bennett, who had taught both Old and New Testament at Hackney, could now confine his lectures to the Old Testament in the joint classes. What one cannot but wonder at is that this co-operation in Theology as in Arts had not begun as soon as Hackney College became so near a neighbour of New College. When I came to London I found still lingering differences of tradition and custom that had probably delayed "a consummation devoutly to be wished". It is to be observed, however, that the subject of Theology in the narrow sense of the word—Dogmatics—was still reserved for each Principal. While I can understand that the Principal of a College, if theology were his main interest, might be unwilling to surrender that subject to another—and here undoubtedly there might be different types of thought—yet some acceptable division with a view to co-operation might have been found. On several occasions, when Dr. Forsyth was prevented by prolonged illness from lecturing, his sheep were allowed to stray into my fold. Need I plead for as much co-operation among the theological colleges in one place as possible? It is a distinct loss that in London the distances of the colleges from one another forbid closer co-operation. It is to me a gratifying recollection that the Dean of St. Paul's, Dr. Matthews, as a student attended an Inter-collegiate course of lectures I was giving on the Development of the Religious Consciousness, a subject to which he has since made so many valuable contributions; and another is that so distinguished a scholar as Dr. Theodore Robinson of Cardiff University attended a course of lectures on the History of Religions, which, on account of the illness of one of the teachers, I gave at Regent's Park College. To the closer co-operation of Hackney and New College with Regent's Park College I shall later again return. Doubtless it was the larger demands of the University connexion that led to this co-operation

of the two Colleges, and that closer co-operation was also the occasion of my being invited to the Joint Professorship of the Comparative Study of Religions, Philosophical Theism, and Christian Ethics in 1903, subjects included in the University requirements for the B.D. These subjects I taught to the first set of students (four out of six in the last year) who added the B.D. to other degrees they already held.

(3) In the same classes were included some students from Cheshunt College, as its work was largely suspended because negotiations were going on in 1903-4 for the union of this College with Hackney College. "The Negotiations with Cheshunt College", says the Hackney College Report,

> were necessarily terminated by the decision of the Board of Education (due to the judgment of the House of Lords on the Scotch Church) that no union could be sanctioned because there were differences between the doctrinal standards of the two Institutions.

The standard of Cheshunt College was an extreme Calvinism, as I discovered when in 1895 I was offered the professorship in the subjects Dr. Reynolds had taught: the demand for acceptance would have been a sufficient deterrent even had I not had another valid reason for declining, namely, that I had just entered on the pastorate in Montrose. By Act of Parliament Cheshunt College was later relieved of its very rigid doctrinal requirements, and allowed to remove to Cambridge. I leave it to my readers to judge whether the decision of the Board of Education was, or was not, a benefit to the Congregational Churches. The advantage of having one College less must be weighed against that of being represented at Cambridge as well as at Oxford. One result of the failure to carry through the negotiations was that Dr. Andrews, who had been a professor in Cheshunt, came to New College as successor to Dr. Adeney, who, having accepted the Principalship of Lancashire College, bade farewell to the College at the luncheon at which I was welcomed. My first public function in London was at the meeting held on May 14th, 1903, in West Hampstead Congregational Church, to celebrate the Centenary of Hackney College.

(4) When I was appointed Principal of New College in 1907 a reorganization took place, which I mention because it affords me the occasion for recording a judgment to which I attach some value; I was asked, and desired to continue, my philosophical lectures, and as Dr. H. H. Scullard, who was appointed as my successor, was relieved of that subject, which made greater demands in regard to lectures than did the remaining subjects, I proposed that he should undertake the subject of Church History, and so relieve Dr. Andrews, as his other subject, the New Testa-

ment, had a claim for his whole time. Here are my reasons: I had had the privilege of attending the inspiring lectures of Dr. Edward Caird, the finest teacher I have had, on philosophy in my Arts Course in Glasgow University, and had a permanent interest in the subject, and would have felt a loss if I had not myself continued teaching it. Unlike some of the younger theologians of today, obsessed by Dr. Karl Barth, I do not believe in the isolation of the Christian religion from the other religions of mankind, nor of its theology from philosophy as the focus of the general culture of an age. To be saved from dogmatism and sectarianism Christian theology needs the widest intellectual horizons; God as Revealer and Redeemer must not be severed from God as Creator, Preserver and Ruler, nor Christ from nature and history, of which He is the fulfilment. Accordingly I wanted in my teaching to hold closely together both philosophy and theology, and also theology and ethics in a comprehensive and constructive apologetics, dogmatics, and ethics as an organic whole. Here specialization is out of place. But in other subjects, such as the New Testament and Church History, specialization is imperative, owing to the multitude of the facts to be treated with meticulous accuracy: hence the assignment of work I proposed for Dr. Andrews and Dr. Scullard. The specialist needs a wide general culture lest he fall into the danger of knowing more and more about less and less, and becoming a dry-as-dust scholar and no more.

(5) The War 1914-1919 confronted all the theological colleges with some serious problems; here I confine myself to indicating how the organization of the College was affected. As conscription was not introduced till 1916, most of the students continued at college, except those who felt it their duty to offer their services in the Army or in Y.M.C.A. work among the troops; to them the authorities gave every encouragement, while bringing no pressure on any of the others. Men in their last year in 1916-1917 were not in any way affected, but were allowed to complete their course. A few (four) were exempted from the army on medical grounds, but the others (nine in all) were required to do alternative service, and worked on the land, with which they contrived to combine charge of the village churches near them, or preaching in the neighbourhood. In Hackney College and Regent's Park College there was a similar reduction in numbers. After Easter, 1917, only four students remained in college, and one left in June. The Governors at the Annual Meeting on June 19th resolved that even if no students remained, they would keep the valuable staff together; the professors gave lectures to ministers at Whitefield's, and re-arranged the Library. In the session 1917-1918 there were only nine students in three colleges; they lived together at Hackney College, till it was requisitioned, as Regent's Park and New had been at an earlier

date, and then were dispersed in lodgings; lectures were given on alternate days in Dr. Forsyth's study and in mine.

From the beginning of 1919 the joint classes were held in New College when use of it was recovered. This closer association of the Colleges in war-time was found so advantageous that it was resolved it should become a permanent arrangement. All subjects, except those of doctrine and practical training, reserved by the Principals, were taught in joint classes. With ten teachers available, this organization allowed of a greater variety in the courses of study offered, and more specialization on the part of some of the teachers. The students who returned to college from war-work, as well as those who were admitted from the Army, needed special consideration. There was no intention to continue permanently with so large a staff. During the illness of Prof. Davies in 1919-1920 Dr. Gould most generously undertook his duties. On Professor Green's retirement Dr. Andrews undertook all the New Testament teaching. On Dr. Scullard's death Prof. Farrer took over some of his subjects as well as his own. When Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson succeeded Dr. Gould, he lectured on the History and Religion of the Old Testament, while Prof. Davies taught the Hebrew language. It was a very great advantage to the students of Hackney College and New College to hear the lectures of so fine a scholar as Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson is—and one with so keen a spiritual insight. In the session 1919-1920 over ninety students were in attendance at the lectures. Two women preparing for the ministry were admitted to the shortened course provided for the ex-service men. By special arrangement, so that American students serving in the Forces in France might continue their courses while waiting for transport across the Atlantic, twenty-one students from the American Expeditionary Force attended a special four months' course (March to June, 1919). It was a benefit to the students that Baptists and Congregationalists were brought into so close intercourse; without any loss of differing convictions, dividing prejudices were removed. It was a keen regret to me when this co-operation with Regent's Park College was brought to an end in June, 1937, by the concentration of its work in Oxford. There it is co-operating with Mansfield College, as is the Methodist College in Cambridge with Cheshunt College. The more such closer relations of Free Church Colleges at least can be secured the better not only for theology, but for the interests of the Churches; and, as I have already indicated, the closer their association with a University the greater will be the gain.

(6) Hackney College, with a reduced number of its own students, would have been in great financial difficulties, as certain overhead charges had to be met whatever the number might be, had not the arrangement begun in the war continued; and a

number of New College students remained in residence there. This arrangement prepared the way for a still closer relation of the two colleges. When Dr. Forsyth died in 1921, after twenty years as Principal of Hackney College, a Committee was appointed to consider whether the two colleges could not be worked as one institution, and the recommendation to that effect was adopted by the Annual Meetings in June, 1922. I was appointed Principal of Hackney College as well as of New, and, as I accepted only on condition that I should have no direct responsibility for the residential organization at Hackney College, and should not be expected to remove to the Principal's house there, the Rev. A. J. Horrocks, one of the Arts teachers, was appointed Warden, matters of discipline being referred to me. As the separation of the Trusts involved expense and inconvenience, the Board of Education was asked to sanction their union, but refused on the same grounds as the union of Hackney College and Cheshunt College had been refused. Steps were then taken to secure the union by a private Bill; this became an Act on July 14th, 1924. In these two sessions (the interim period) I was Principal of Hackney College and of New College, on the union I became Principal of one College under the double-barrelled name Hackney and New College. In 1922-23 seventeen of the twenty-two New College students were residing at Hackney, but on four days a week all dined at New at the close of the lectures there.

(7) The two buildings continued to be used, the one (Hackney) as residence for the students, and the other (New) for lectures and classes; both were in full use. Some of the business men in the interests of economy brought forward the proposal that one of the buildings should be sold, and the additional accommodation should be provided at the other. Although those who made the proposals professed their indifference which College was to be the victim, yet it was inevitable that New College would suffer that fate, as it had been decided that the College should continue to be residential, and Hackney College alone could offer the necessary conditions. I opposed the proposals on the ground that they were premature, as in the preceding negotiations such a possibility had not even been envisaged by the Governors, former students, and other friends of New College, and the union must be allowed to become real in sentiment as well as law before any such change could be attempted without exciting keen resentment. Assurances were given that no attempt would be made to force the issue, so as to provoke division. Happily just at this moment a favourable alternative presented itself. Regent's Park College sold the remainder of its lease, as the intention was to remove ultimately to Oxford, but for a time to continue its functions partly there and partly in London. The use of New College for certain purposes, the storing

of its valuable extensive library, the common meals of the students, *etc.*, was granted at a rent that lessened the cost of the maintenance of the two buildings. After my retirement, as my successor, Dr. Cave, desired to live at Hackney College, Regent's Park rented the Principal's house as a Hostel for some of its students, and these arrangements were continued until the New College buildings were sold by auction on December 10th, 1934; and now where stood one of the finest buildings, if not the finest, in Hampstead, admired by all who passed it, stands what to me, as often as I pass —and that is as seldom as I can—is an eyesore, a hideous mass of mansions. I recognize that for various reasons the sale was inevitable, but it was none the less regrettable. A considerable part of the large sum obtained, £63,000, has been spent on the enlargement of Hackney College, to provide adequate library and class room, dining room and chapel, common room and increased bedroom and study, accommodation for forty-two students. It was decided on 12th June, 1936, that the building so enlarged should be known as New College. While the one college kept its local habitation, by a fair exchange the other kept its name. On 4th May, 1938, the new building was opened by the Earl of Athlone, and dedicated in a prayer which it was my privilege to offer. May its future under my successor, Dr. Cave, excel its past! Having had experience of both the residential and non-residential systems, I am not so confident about the advantage of the one over the other. The record I have attempted of New College, when the students lived in lodgings, and dined together in college, and the history of the preceding half-century, forbid any unfavourable comparison. It is a story of which none of its former students or teachers needs to be ashamed.

II.

I have in my autobiography (*Memoirs and Meanings of my Life*) paid my tribute of appreciation and gratitude to my colleagues, most of whom I have had occasion to mention in this record, and I must content myself with saying that my relations with them all were altogether happy. To one fact may I be forgiven if I call attention. Three of the present staff, Dr. Cave (the Principal), Prof. Davies, and Dr. Horrocks, were all students in my classes; one, Dr. Matthews, prepared his thesis for the Ph.D. degree under my supervision; and to one only, Dr. Lee Woolf, have I not had the relation of teacher.

I turn to a subject which should be of interest and importance to the readers of the *Congregational Quarterly*, namely, the relation of the College to the churches:

(1) It is imperative that that relation should be as intimate as possible, while the colleges preserve their desirable independence;

they should share in, and contribute to, the common life of the churches as fully as their function allows. This is the primary reason; but there are four subsidiary reasons: from the churches the colleges should draw a constant supply of suitable candidates for training for the ministry; while the colleges would need to close their doors had they no endowments, the churches should recognize their responsibility, partial though it be, for their support in recognition of the service which they render in providing a properly educated ministry; in the churches the students should have the opportunity to try their "prentice hands" as preachers; to the churches the students should be able to look for spheres of service, in the fulfilment of their vocation as ministers of Christ and His Church. Before any rules were suggested, the practice at New College was to require from every candidate a recommendation not only from his church and his pastor, but also from the County Union: while some of the Unions did take pains to qualify themselves to give such a recommendation, others were very lax in fulfilling their duty in this regard. It was also my practice in the settlement of students to keep in as close touch with the Moderators, when these were appointed; and I gladly testify to their cordial co-operation. I always insisted that the Moderator, or, in his absence, a representative of the County Union, should take some part, preferably preside, at an Ordination; and that, as far as I was concerned, became the uniform practice. The deacons of one church did not believe in Moderators, but yielded to my friendly insistence, and the Moderator found an entrance till then barred. A most gratifying feature has been the generous appreciation shown of the services of the students as supplies, and the ease with which most of the students of the College secured settlements. I was disappointed if, at the end of their course, they had not all had calls, or were expecting one. Here organization falls short in effectiveness if the personal contact of the Principal and Professors of the College with the churches is not maintained.

(2) Valuable, too, is the co-operation of the Colleges with one another: it is a caricature to represent the colleges as rivals competing for candidates and lowering their standard of admission to increase their numbers. The candidate was expected to indicate in his application if he had applied to any other college, and, if he had, the Principal was expected to communicate with that college to learn the reason why he had not been accepted; and that rule was generally observed. Twice I wrote a letter of remonstrance, when it had been disregarded. On May 12th, 1909, on the initiative of the Committee of Lancashire College, a Conference of the representatives of the Colleges was held at New College, and a Consultative College Board to promote closer co-operation was appointed. In April, 1918, a two days' Conference of the twelve colleges com-

prised in the College Board was held at the Memorial Hall. At this Conference it was shown that the Colleges were not training more men than the needs of the churches warranted: the possibilities of uniting colleges was canvassed, but the local difficulties were recognized: a recommendation was made to the Colleges to frame schemes of pensions for their staffs, and this recommendation was accepted by the Governors of Hackney College and New College: to these two Colleges alone belongs the credit of carrying through a union during the period under review.

(3) The Ministerial Training Committee appointed by the Congregational Union in 1930, of which all the Principals are *ex officio* members along with others appointed by the Union, took over the functions of the Consultative College Board formed in 1909. With this Committee the Special Committee which bears the sole responsibility in deciding in any difficulty the question of ministerial status has come to an understanding that when it is decided to assign to any candidate for recognition on Lists A or B an educational test, the Ministerial Training Committee shall be consulted as to what that test will be. In my judgment the organization for the training of ministers, and the relation of the Congregational Union and the Churches to the Colleges, has gone as far as is practicable and desirable. Four of the retired Principals are ex-Chairmen of the Union, and two of the present Principals: so far from the Colleges seeking to live and work apart, their aim is to promote the vital interests of the Churches and the Union in their own distinctive task: the scholarly study of the Holy Scriptures, the intelligible interpretation of the Gospel, and the adequate training of the heralds of the Gospel, the ministers of the Church of Christ.

Students of the nature of the Church should not miss Prof. C. F. Rogers's **A Church Genuinely Catholic* (S.P.C.K., 6s.). Mr. Rogers is always worth reading for his quotations alone, and for Free Churchmen this book will be beneficial in that it emphasizes aspects of the Church they are prone to minimize, even though it is probable they will at times find it a great irritant. The first part, outlining the debt of the Church to Jew, Greek, and Roman, is very sound, and then follows an examination of the nature of Catholicism in the form of an exposition of the Vincentian formula. Here we feel more protest, but most of all in the collection of addresses at the end; we hope that Prof. Rogers has moved quite a lot since his address in 1922 on "What the Churches Stand For". Our main disagreement with Prof. Rogers is that he makes no allowance for differences of temperament; all must believe in the same way, observe the same sacraments, and so on; he never seems to conceive that while sacramental observances may be natural and helpful to one man, they may be just the reverse to another. And the notion that there is a genuinely catholic church which has for nineteen centuries believed in the same way and worshipped in the same way has only to be stated to appear ridiculous. "Whose service is perfect freedom" is a sentence the learned apologist might ponder.

J. V. BARTLET.

By Dr. A. J. Carlyle.

It was in 1886 that Mansfield College was transferred to Oxford, and the long separation between the theological studies of the Free Churches and Oxford was ended, and, with the settlement of Dr. Fairbairn and of his colleagues in Oxford, a new and remarkable adventure was begun. It is true that with the abolition of the Tests in 1871, and the creation of the Honours School of Theology in 1872, it was open to anyone to study theology in Oxford, but so far the teaching of theology had been in the hands of members of the Church of England, and it was a new thing that one of the Free Churches should establish in Oxford a body of teachers and scholars in theology.

It must not indeed be forgotten that the Free Churches in England had, in the 17th and 18th centuries, built up a great system of general and theological education; indeed, there have been few efforts more remarkable than that by which this was done, in spite of the greatest difficulties; and these efforts have developed and maintained a high level of learning in the ministry of the Free Churches. It was, however, a happy day when the theological teachers and students, Free Church and Anglican, were brought to Oxford to study and to learn together—a great adventure, but one which has proved successful.

Dr. Bartlet was among the earliest members of the staff of Mansfield College, coming to it from classical and philosophical studies at Exeter College, Oxford, and it was to the study of theology in Mansfield College, and in the University of Oxford, that he gave his life for more than fifty years. I think it will be of some interest and value to consider briefly the nature of his contribution to the great development which has taken place.

I am not here endeavouring to set out a critical account of Bartlet's whole theological work, but rather to draw attention to his contribution to the better understanding between Anglicans and Free Churchmen by means of their common labours, and mutual help, in theological studies; but before going on to that I should wish to point out that he was primarily, as well as professionally, a scholar.

He served his apprenticeship in the admirable articles which he contributed to Dr. Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible,* and to the *Encyclopædia Britannica.* It is indeed in these and similar critical essays that we find him becoming one of the most learned scholars of our generation in Oxford in the New Testament and the early

Patristic literature. His friends may indeed regret that so much of his best work should have been absorbed in the quasi anonymity of these great encyclopædias, but it must be remembered how much they have helped in setting forward our knowledge and forming our judgments.

Happily in one book at least he was able to set out a developed and co-ordinated account of his conception of the history, both of the doctrine and institutions, of the Christian Church, specially of the first six centuries. This book indeed, *Christianity in History*, bears my name as well as his, but my share was very much smaller than his, and much more superficial. The greater part of the book is his, and especially the penetrating and illuminating account of the development of Christian thought. There are no doubt many ways in which this may be approached, but the one way which is certainly wrong is the presentation of this simply as a conflict between truth and falsehood, between orthodoxy and heresy; while it is really the history of the slow and difficult effort by which Christian men endeavoured to bring the intellectual analysis of what seemed to them to be the truth into accord with the more profound but often undefinable apprehension of their spiritual experience.

There are few greater absurdities than the attempt to set aside the study of the philosophical or intellectual aspects of religion on the ground that they do not concern the practical religion of the good man. It is quite true these are not to be confused with religion itself; but men, in proportion to their intellectual powers, are compelled to give to themselves and to others some reasonable account of the nature of God and of man.

In Bartlet's historical treatment of Christian doctrine he set out with an admirable and patient sympathy the complex elements, not so much of controversy, as of co-ordination, which go to make up what we recognize as truth.

To turn now to Bartlet's great services rendered during his work of more than fifty years in the theological studies of Oxford to a better understanding among English Christians. There has been much talk about the reunion of the Churches, sometimes hopeful, sometimes despondent, but it is not always noticed how important have been the steps towards this, and especially the development of mutual sympathy and co-operation among theologians in this country.

There have been three main lines of progress in this matter during the last hundred and fifty years. The first and most fundamental has been the influence of that great revival of religion of which the Methodist and the Tractarian movements represent different forms; but behind the difference of form we can now see a unity of substance.

I have a lively recollection of an observation of an old friend who had for many years belonged to the Tractarian tradition, and then went over to the Liberals. He said that, coming back to Oxford after many years, he now found his old friends of the Tractarian tradition speaking in the accents of the Methodist preacher—and the observation was just.

I do not undervalue the development in the modern representatives of the Tractarian tradition, but I think that the change of language represents not the abandonment of what they once held, but rather the apprehension that, behind their differences, Tractarian and Methodist alike feel the profound significance of the personal and individual response to the Christian faith.

The revival of religion in the later 18th and in the 19th century might seem only to have increased the religious differences in England, but in fact it has brought men nearer to each other in the experience of the common quality in religion.

The second important form of the movement towards a better understanding among men of different ecclesiastical opinions has been the great development of mutual aid and co-operation among theological scholars. I may be allowed to lay some stress upon this, for it is easily recognized in the Universities, and not least in Oxford. It was one of the most important services which Bartlet rendered to religion and theology that he should have done so much to set this forward.

Dr. Bartlet was, like myself, a pupil of Dr. Sanday, one of the most distinguished New Testament scholars of the last generation, whose contributions to the historical criticism and understanding of the New Testament were among the most valuable achievements of English theology of that time; but even these were not more important than his services to religion and learning in promoting and organizing the co-operative work, not merely of men of different schools in the Church of England, but of scholars of every Church in Oxford.

I do not wish to speak dogmatically upon a subject which is outside my proper work, which lies rather in history than in theology, but I doubt whether any work of recent years has done so much to advance critical theology in England as the volume entitled *Studies in The Synoptic Problem*, produced by Dr. Sanday and the distinguished scholars who were members of the Seminar, or Class, which he directed. And one of the most valuable members of that class was Dr. Bartlet, a Congregational minister and a Professor of Mansfield College.

I was myself only able to take part in the Class for a short time, but even a short experience has left me with the impression of its great value in teaching us not merely how much may be, and indeed has been, done by such co-operation, but also what an

enlarging and corrective influence this had upon our mutual appreciation and understanding. I doubt whether the services which Dr. Sanday rendered to the promotion of the unity of spirit among the theologians have been very adequately recognized, but they were very real; and Dr. Bartlet continued the tradition of Dr. Sanday.

For nearly fifty years he gave invaluable help as the Secretary and Organizer of the "Society for Historical Theology". The origin of the Society is interesting, for it arose out of the felicitous and magnanimous action on the part of the group of distinguished scholars who were the first members of the staff of Manchester College in Oxford. They had founded in Manchester, principally among the members of their own Church, a Society for the discussion of theological questions, but on their settlement in Oxford in 1889 they recognized that if its membership was restricted in any way its range and value would be greatly limited. In 1893, therefore, they offered to reconstruct the Society without any restriction of opinion.

Its title has served to indicate that though its discussions are free from all restraint, they are not intended for controversy, but for the consideration of theological research.

As I have said, Bartlet was from the first its Secretary, and for nearly fifty years arranged the meetings of the Society and the papers read to it, and this could not have been in more competent hands. He had a profound reverence for any serious and sincere pursuit of learning, and an almost universal acquaintance with theological scholars in this country, and was not merely well acquainted with all the developments of European theology, but with many of the most distinguished scholars themselves, and he was able to enlist the help of men of every religious body and school of thought. Our Presidents, who are elected annually, and our members, have included, beside members of the Churches of England and Scotland and the Free Churches, eminent representatives of the Roman Catholics, and of the Jewish faith, like the late Claude Montefiore, whose death all men of religion continue to lament.

As an example of the spirit of our meetings I may be allowed to refer to the paper read to us by Montefiore, as Chairman. Instead of reading a paper representing his great learning in Biblical and Rabbinical literature, he read one on the nature and atmosphere of the religion in which he was brought up in his own home and family—an admirable contribution to contemporary history—and I think that all who were present were deeply touched by the confidence which he showed that his unsentimental but moving description of this would be met by a real and profound sympathy.

No doubt normally our papers and discussions dealt with the

more traditional aspects of theological learning, and it was right that it should be so, but I speak of this as showing that when I refer to the unifying effects of our common studies I do not mean only that our intellectual and critical judgments were enlarged, but that we learned to understand each other better and more intimately.

I think it is also true to say that the Society contributed not a little to enable us in Oxford to bring together in one Theological Faculty all those who are engaged in teaching Theology in Oxford; for it had brought us together informally, had made us acquainted with each other, and with each other's thoughts and judgments, both in religion and theology.

The third great impulse to a better understanding and co-operation among Christian men has come from the profound sense of the imperative need for the reform of our social and economic conditions. Some religious men are very ready to denounce such an alarming phrase as the "Class War", but they have not shown the same anxiety to ask what may be the cause of the "Class War". Bartlet felt, and justly, that this was a great error among religious men, and he made a valuable contribution toward a better understanding of our social and economic problems when he persuaded a group of serious and capable men to contribute to a volume on the history and nature of Property from the standpoint not only of history but also of philosophy, and he obtained a valuable Introduction from Bishop Gore, the successor of Maurice and Westcott, as the leader of those who in the Church of England were convinced of the need of a radical change in the principles and forms of our social conditions.

I have spoken of Bartlet's great services to theological learning, and of his admirable work in bringing together the scholars of different Churches, not so much in argument as in co-operation in research and learning. But I cannot conclude without a word upon his personal qualities. He was almost my oldest friend in Oxford, and for about sixty years I have known him, and felt a great respect and affection for him. He was learned, and persevering in learning, but he was the most modest and unassuming of men; he had strong convictions but he had also a great respect for other men's convictions; he was a hard worker, but never too busy to help other scholars, and indeed other men. He was learned, but he was also a man of very simple and sincere piety.

MR. KENNETH INGRAM'S VIEWS ON SEX-MORALITY.

By Dr. C. J. Cadoux.

With some diffidence I stoop to pick up the gauntlet thrown down in the October issue of this *Quarterly* regarding Mr. Kenneth Ingram's book, *Sex-Morality To-morrow*. The Editor calls it "a brave book which will almost certainly get him into trouble", accuses the Church of having shirked the sex-issue, and calls upon her to get to work on the subject without delay.

Mr. Kenneth Ingram is the author of many books on current religious and ethical problems, and has already produced two others on sex, *An Outline of Sexual Morality* (1922) and *The Modern Attitude to the Sex Problem* (1930). I have looked carefully through both of these. They anticipate in the main the views advanced in the new book, but do so in a less extreme and what strikes me as a more religious spirit. As *Sex-Morality To-morrow* gives us his latest views, I propose to confine myself to it.

The position advocated therein is as follows. The "orthodox" Christian view on sex-morality is being rightly discredited today, and will soon be largely discarded. It is based on the negative Puritan idea of sex as something unclean and not fit to be mentioned. Its theory regarding the requirements (particularly the prohibitions) incidental to monogamy have in the past led to much insincerity and hypocrisy, and have involved untold suffering for married women. It was mistaken in regarding all extra-marital sex-intercourse as sinful. It vastly over-estimated the importance of sexual conduct generally.

What then is the right alternative? Mr. Ingram's answer is, Wherever mutual love exists, and therewith a mutual desire for intercourse, intercourse should be regarded as harmless. He does not indeed advocate promiscuity: he would disapprove of sex-indulgence as a mere means of satisfying the physical craving, holding that in such cases the will should keep the passions under control. He would require that contraceptives should be used to ensure that *experimental* love-unions should be childless. He holds that the genuineness of the love-relationship is tested by its permanence, and that therefore the best type of such relationship is monogamous. Yet he contends that even a mutual temporary infatuation satisfies the condition that love morally justifies intercourse. Even a school-boy accustomed to sleep with girls is "rightly or wrongly" (!) likely in the future to get from his head-master nothing more severe than a friendly warning to wait until

he is genuinely in love, and permission in the meantime to practise not-too-frequent and therefore harmless masturbation.

A certain ambiguity attends Mr. Ingram's arguments, in that he does not sharply distinguish (a) what, in his view, the law of the future will allow, (b) what, in his view, public opinion in the future will view as permissible, and (c) what he himself would regard as morally right. These standards often seem to be roughly equated in his pages. Realizing that morality secured by coercion is imperfect, he deprecates legal restraints except in the most extreme cases, where "conduct is definitely anti-social". With his forecasts of the future, as regards either legislation or public opinion, I am not here directly concerned. What I wish to discuss is the ethical rightness or wrongness of the practices and standards which he himself seems to anticipate with approval.

Let us, by way of approach, first consider the nature of sex-desire generally. I hardly need to say that I hold no brief for the view that it is inherently unclean or evil. As a natural emotion, it can justly claim to play some part in a full-orbed life. It is found in good company: on the one hand, it is linked with the deepest and tenderest human affections, and on the other, it lies close alongside the sense of beauty. The normal face and well-formed body, in youthful health and fitness, not only stir sex-desire, but share with the flowers, the trees, mountain-scenery, and the evening sky, the function of providing our objective standards of physical beauty: hence the legitimate place of the nude in art.

At the same time, the more we appreciate the positive value of the sex-element in life, the more does it behove us to give heed to the old warning, *"Corruptio optimi pessima"*. There are, even on a superficial view, various characteristics of the sex-appetite which should warn us that it is a factor of unique significance in human life. Among the emotional impulses as a class, it stands very much by itself. It differs from the other bodily appetites in requiring intimate association with another person. It differs from the other social passions in needing to culminate in a bodily act. Meanwhile, its enormous strength, its insidious character, and the intensity of the pleasure accompanying its indulgence, point in the same direction, and advise us to walk warily. We seem at the outset to be in the presence of a strange and wonderful side of human nature; and we must be careful not to over-simplify the issues it raises. The obvious rule, "Do as you feel inclined"—a sufficient guide with desires of a less portentous nature—is likely to mislead us here, unless it is very carefully qualified.

Such preliminary caution is seen to be entirely justified when we look at our problem more closely. The sex-act is invariably followed by an emotional reaction and some measure of physical exhaustion and debility. *"Omne animal"*, as the old dictum went,

"post coitum triste". Recall the story of Amnon, David's son, who fell violently in love with his half-sister Tamar. After he had gratified his passion, we are told, "Amnon hated her with exceeding great hatred; for the hatred wherewith he hated her was greater than the love wherewith he had loved her" (*2 Sam.* 13[15]). His case was indeed aggravated by the fact that the infatuation was not mutual, and that Amnon knew he was trespassing; but it serves to illustrate the peril awaiting those who indulge incautiously.

A pointer in the same direction is the fact that the human body is not only beautiful and attractive, but is also capable of being under certain conditions ugly and repulsive. This tendency, although specially characteristic of old age and of abnormal states of illness, is not confined to such conditions: furthermore, it is particularly connected with those regions of the body which are the special field of sex-interest.

What, however, most unmistakably reveals the exceedingly grave character of the sex-instinct is that Nature, unless she is artificially interfered with, is apt to follow up the committal of the sex-act with conception, a long period of pregnancy, and the birth of a child. I am not here assuming that the *sole* purpose of sexual intercourse, in the intention of Nature, is the production of offspring. I am simply observing how Nature normally acts. Now the birth of a child is, on any showing, an extremely serious event. It suspends the indulgence of the sex-appetite; but it calls forth the wonderful instinct of maternal love, and it introduces a host of new experiences and vital responsibilities. And it is in order to meet rightly the needs of such a situation that monogamous marriage and family-life have been instituted.

Mr. Kenneth Ingram fully recognizes the seriousness of bringing children into the world; and he therefore urges that, wherever intercourse takes place prior to monogamous marriage, the production of offspring should be prevented by means of contraceptives. He is clear that there is no moral objection to the use of these means for such a purpose; and he parries the argument that it is an artificial interference with Nature by saying that so too is the medical treatment of disease. This plea, however, is singularly unconvincing. When science treats disease, she is assisting, not thwarting, the normal purposes of Nature. It is true that *in a certain limited sense* disease can rightly be described as "natural". But it does not follow from the rightness of artificially fighting disease and death that it is right to interfere artificially with Nature's vital machinery in the life of normal and healthy persons. We may grant that the production of children is not the only purpose of sex-union, and that, in special circumstances, while intercourse between married persons may be right, yet the production of children is inadvisable. But these are cases of illness or at least

the grave threat of it. In what is known as "the safe period" Nature seems to have provided, not indeed an absolute defence against conception, but a precaution which persons so placed will usually find sufficient. But even the use of artificial contraceptives *in such cases* would prove nothing for the normally healthy. And I submit that any sex-practice which necessitates the regular use of an artificial preventive on the part of persons in normal health is a direct repudiation of the clear guidance of Nature and is therefore morally wrong.

One last observation Nature enables us to make. The numbers of men and women born into the world are not exactly equal, there usually being in most races a surplus of one sex or the other, not always of the same, and never amounting to more than a very small percentage. Nothing even remotely approaching widespread polygamy could claim any support from the statistics of population. This fact points in the same direction as do (a) the normal preliminary to marriage, namely, falling in love, which (unlike mere sex-passion) is monogamous, and (b) the family-responsibilities incidental to the production of offspring.

In these ways, then, Nature suggests to us that sex-desire is of such a kind that—without starving or undervaluing it—we must be prepared to find stringent conditions necessary in the indulgence of it, if it is not to land us in disaster. Nothing is more certainly wrong than the light-hearted Philistine attitude, which treats sex-matters as a casual, ordinary human concern, devoid of all mystery —as something on which scrupulous caution and strong moral convictions are wasted. Mr. Ingram waxes impatient over the conventions, taboos, and legalistic principles so long maintained by "orthodoxy". But he forgets that most established conventions have been accepted and perpetuated only because they rested in the first place on strong grounds. Whatever mistakes and excesses therefore our Puritan forefathers may have committed, they at least had very good reason for regarding sex-morality as a matter of vital importance.

Man's experience of the use of drugs makes it clear that there are within his reach other unspeakably delightful enjoyments which, being inevitably followed by misery, he takes only at his grievous peril. Sexual indulgence, unqualified by stringent safeguards, has over and over again proved itself similarly deceitful. Hence our need to

> unmask those counterfeits of bliss,
> Which to believe thy deep undoing is—
> Joys which but lure to leave thee,
> And leave to grieve thee,
> Not of that fine-spun stuff
> That from the eternal spool

My hands would weave thee!
Enough, enough!
How long shall they deceive thee,
And thou still dote
Importuning high Heaven
That more be given
With cries monotonous as the wry-neck's note?

But have Christians no other guidance than their observation and experience of "Nature"? They are surely right in regarding the teaching of Jesus on these matters as authoritative. Disagreeing though Mr. Ingram does with the general Christian tradition on sex-morals, he desires to believe that Jesus Himself would approve of what he himself recommends. The Church, he thinks, from Paul onwards, and especially the Puritans, took up a very different attitude from that taken by Jesus Himself.

But are these beliefs soundly based? From the assertion of Jesus that the harlots would precede the Scribes and Pharisees into the Kingdom (*Matt.* 21^{31}), and from His words to the adulteress, "Neither do I condemn thee" (*John* 8^{11}), Mr. Ingram infers that He did not regard sex-offences as very serious. Nothing could be more erroneous. The harlots were more accessible to His appeal than were the Scribes and Pharisees; but it did not follow that He condoned harlotry as other than hideously sinful. Similarly inconclusive is His rhetorical allusion to the lesser blameworthiness of Sodom (*Luke* 10^{12} = *Matt.* 10^{15}, 11^{24}). His words to the adulteress meant, as the context makes obvious, that He would not pronounce a legal penalty: His immediately ensuing words, "Go, and sin no more", show that He believed she had sinned. His acceptance of the Decalogue and His inclusion of adultery and fornication among the evil and defiling things issuing from the heart of man (*Mark* 7^{21-23}—*Matt.* 15^{18-20}) prove that, however charitable He might be to the sinner, He did not take a light view of the sin. So acute was His sense of the guilt of adultery that, with emphasis of a characteristically Oriental type, He declared that the man who should look upon a (married) woman with lustful intent had committed adultery with her already in his heart (*Matt.* 5^{27ff}).

From the conclusion to which this evidence points there is no escape in the remark that we are no longer fundamentalists. The historical evidence for the teaching of Jesus on sex is on the whole indubitable. And if we refuse to regard His well-attested principles of ethical conduct as authoritative for us, we cannot justify such disobedience simply by saying that we are no longer Victorian fundamentalists.

Of great moment for our purpose is the allusion of Jesus to a married couple as "that which God has joined together" (*Mark* 10^{9} = *Matt.* 19^{6}). It is often contended that this phrase can rightly

refer only to the *happily* married, that it is a misuse of words to apply it to married persons who do not love one another. Mr. Ingram quotes a smart remark of Mr. Bernard Shaw's to the effect that "the idea that in the phrase 'whom God hath joined' the word 'God' means the Rev. John Smith or William Jones or the district registrar must be got rid of". Yet if the context of the saying in the Gospels be considered, we see at once that it must refer to married couples *as such*. The fact that it was called forth by a discussion of those contemplating divorce proves that it does ***not*** mean the happily married only, but also the unhappily married. That is to say, Jesus sees in the normally consummated marriage a bond so sacred that it cannot thereafter be rightly dissolved in such a way as to permit of a fresh marriage by either party. Hence His well-known disapproval of divorce (the loopholes allowed in *Matt.* 5^{32} and 19^{9} [*cf. Mark* 10^{11f}, *Luke* 16^{18}] being clear glosses). He views the sex-act as setting up a new relationship of personal intimacy between the parties, of so far-reaching and momentous a character that it cannot thereafter be rightly reversed by the re-marriage of either of them. One may, if one wishes, regard this teaching as mistaken: one can hardly, I submit, deny that such is its meaning.

But is it mistaken? Most endeavours to be wiser than Jesus on great ethical and religious issues do not encourage the hope that we are able to improve on His insight. And what does experience in this case say? Has not our own observation of "Nature's" verdict prepared us for exactly that sort of decision which our interpretation of the teaching of Jesus reveals to have been His own belief? In the profound sanctity of the union of life with life through the sacrament of sexual fellowship, and, I would say, nowhere else, we have the key to that element of awe-inspiring mystery and morally-exacting weight connected with it which our simple survey of the palpable facts has revealed to us. Ethical systems like Mr. Ingram's, which betray an inadequate sense of the far-reaching responsibilities accompanying sex-fellowship, stand condemned not only for rejecting the authority of Jesus, but for being based on too superficial a study of the moral and psychological data involved.

To blame the orthodox view therefore for making the observance of a mere ceremony the test of the legitimacy of a union, is to miss the point. On any fair interpretation of the orthodox view, the ceremony is important only because it is the public expression and acknowledgment on the part of both persons of the new and solemn responsibility which they undertake. It was always presupposed and indeed openly declared that what justified the public act was the avowed desire of the man and the woman to live together as husband and wife. Much is made of the frequency with which husbands and wives fall out, lose their love for one another, but

continue to cohabit in merely external, fruitless, and indeed immoral obedience to an orthodox law of respectability. But the fact that such conduct, partly on account of its privacy, is not legally punishable constitutes no proof that the legal requirement of the marriage-ceremony is unjustified. Moreover, because many people, especially those who approach matrimony with an insufficient idea of its responsibilities and perhaps no sense of its deep sanctity, subsequently find these responsibilities distasteful, is no indication that the responsibilities themselves are illusory.

Mr. Ingram goes astray in his interpretation of Paul. True, Paul discourages marriage; but not because "the sex-act is branded as evil", but because, in view of the urgency of the times, the peril of persecution, and the nearness of Christ's return, it is better for both men and women not to be encumbered with the responsibilities of married life (see *1 Cor.* 7^{28b-35}). Elsewhere, especially in *Eph.* 5^{22-33}, Paul speaks of marriage in highly honorific terms. The idea therefore that he has a different sex-ethic from that of Jesus is mistaken. Neither of them held that celibacy *for its own sake* is part of the Christian ideal; both believed that a consummated sex-union brought permanent responsibilities with it (see *1 Cor.* 6^{16}, $7^{10f.}$); and both believed that, for men charged, as they themselves were, with special tasks relevant to God's Kingdom, voluntary celibacy might be right (see *Matt.* 19^{10-12}).

After Paul's day Oriental notions of the evil of matter, and so on, began to affect the thought of the Church; and these—coupled with a misunderstanding of the New Testament—led eventually to a morbid tendency in some circles to regard even the intercourse of the married as a mere concession to human weakness and to exalt virginity and celibacy as the really ideal state. Hence, therefore, the medieval Catholic view of the superiority of the celibate life, and the insistence on it in the case of "the religious". I should agree with Mr. Ingram in regarding this as an unwholesome phase in Christian history: but the Christian Church is not tied to Rome, and at the Reformation the ascetic ideal was repudiated. It would be a grave mistake to confuse the Puritan reticence on the subject of sex with the Catholic belief in the inferiority of marriage to celibacy, while to accuse the Puritans generally of regarding sexual intercourse in itself as unclean is of course absurd.

Incidentally, Mr. Ingram is also mistaken in ascribing the early Christian horror of abortion to the belief that an unborn child dying unbaptized would go to hell. That belief is not, so far as I am aware, found before the time of Augustine (early in the fifth century), whereas the condemnation of abortion, on the simple ground that it was equivalent to murder, is found frequently from the earliest period.

Mr. Ingram makes the legitimacy of the sex-act depend solely

on the existence of mutual "love" between the two parties committing it, and he includes in the concept of love a temporary infatuation (while greatly preferring that the attachment should be permanent). He is aware of the distinction between emotional and volitional love, and he appreciates the need of disentangling genuine affection from a selfish desire for domination, and so forth. But he does not sufficiently keep these distinctions before him in formulating his practical conclusions. I have already given my reasons for believing that, as regards temporary infatuations at least, his view as to the legitimacy of intercourse is quite certainly wrong, since, apart from other objections, it involves the regular use of contraceptives by the normally healthy. In regard to attachments which promise to be permanent or long-lived, I would observe that, since, on any scheme, there will (as Mr. Ingram admits) be need for persons to exercise severe control of the will over their emotional impulses, both within and without marriage, it is quite within a person's power, after marriage (which of course ought not to be entered on without both volitional and emotional love), to avoid thenceforth any such emotional entanglement as would demand adultery or divorce or prolonged misery.

It must, of course, be frankly admitted that adherence to the orthodox standard of morals in sex is a costly business. Financial conditions and home-responsibilities often make it hard for those genuinely in love with one another to marry. Moreover, many women never receive an offer of marriage at all. It is well known that complete self-denial in the matter of sex is a very severe privation and a frequent source of neurosis. Is not indulgence outside the limits set by marriage justifiable in such cases?

I should reply in the first place that the economic barrier need not be nearly so serious and fatal as it is often felt to be. There is no absolute necessity (however desirable it may be) for every legally-married couple to have a separate home of their own from the start. Be that as it may, there certainly remains a margin of cases in which loyalty to "orthodoxy" involves a very heavy burden. But (a) even for the legally-married there are also severe burdens, though they take a different form, and (b) some painful self-sacrifice is a normal liability of moral life, particularly Christian life. When Jesus spoke figuratively of cutting off hand or foot or plucking out an eye, rather than allow it to cause us to stumble (*Mark* $9^{43\text{-}48}$; *Matt.* $5^{29\text{f.}}$, $18^{8\text{f.}}$), He probably had in mind the self-denial which the law of chastity might impose on one or other of His disciples. But He was assured that such self-denial, however painful, if borne in the right spirit, would justify itself in the sequel.

While disagreeing with Mr. Ingram's main contentions, I would recognize with him that certain changes recently effected in the

traditional code governing the social relations of the sexes have been a distinct advantage. Full sexual intimacy, though possessing a unique importance of its own, is not the only form in which men and women can contribute to each other's pleasure and enrichment. Distinctive experiences in this field are possible over a wide range of differing degrees of closeness. Numerous opportunities of fellowship outside the peculiar intimacy of marriage are open in modern life to men and women, and enable them to minister in wholesome fashion to each other's social and personal welfare. The precise forms which such association can take are naturally determined by convention. The rules, for instance, governing dress and talk and fellowship between men and women, so long as they do not permit or provoke illicit intercourse, are matters for each generation to settle for itself. The enlargement of liberty in these things is to be welcomed, so long as the changes are not made so rapidly that sex-desire becomes unduly provoked through the sudden introduction of new experiences. The kind of attire now customary with women, for example, is a great improvement on the habits of fifty years ago: but had the changes been introduced in one year instead of being spread out over fifty, the moral results would probably have been disastrous.

Into the province of the legal control of sex-life I do not wish to enter, beyond remarking that it ought to be kept more distinct than Mr. Ingram keeps it from the question as to what is right or otherwise for a Christian man to do and to commend. The difference is most clearly seen in the matter of divorce: the standard which a Christian might set himself in obedience to the teaching of Jesus is one thing; the standard which an only partially Christian State should legally permit is possibly something quite different, because the State has to act for persons who do not accept the Christian presuppositions and loyalties.

Summing up, I would urge that, while there is weight in some of the criticisms Mr. Ingram levels against "orthodoxy", his general formula that love, even if only in the form of a temporary infatuation, is itself sufficient to justify sex-intercourse would, if generally accepted, introduce widespread moral chaos. Though willing to recognize minor short-comings in the orthodox view, I hold that in its essential principles it is sound. True, these principles are being widely discarded today; but that fact is no proof that they are being wisely and rightly discarded. However the abandonment of them is excused on the ground that we are living in a new world, it will none the less bring its nemesis in time. Mr. Ingram, it seems to me, is in grave danger of confusing a forecast of sex-morality tomorrow with an approval of what he forecasts.

I do not therefore agree with the claim made for the book on its dust-cover, namely, that "this is a book which can be read . . .

profitably by the young man and woman . . . ". The well-known strength of the sex-urge amply suffices (especially in a day of general revolt against customary moral restraints) to explain the modern discontent with the sex-standards hitherto recognized as wise and right. And to preach to young people at such a time that they can regard the old principles as no longer binding will inevitably delude many into hastily taking advantage of the new liberty commended to them to do what they already feel so strongly inclined to do.

Finally, I regret the Editor's partial commendation of Mr. Ingram's book in the October issue, and his criticism of the Church on the ground that she has failed to guide her young people in sex-matters, and has lost most of them in consequence. The data demand, it seems to me, no such explanation as the criticism presumes: they are amply accounted for by the unwillingness of so many young persons today either to seek or even to accept the guidance of those older and wiser than themselves. Such unwillingness is naturally at its maximum when the guidance involves a difficult check being kept on their strong natural inclinations. There are, however, plenty of young folk left who have been wise enough to accept advice from their Christian seniors, and had the good sense to follow it.

The Rev. L. D. Weatherhead's *This is the Victory* (Hodder, 5s.) contains recent sermons in the City Temple's preacher's well-known style. He thus outlines their "Argument":

> We thought we were making progress, but we were mistaken. Our philosophy of life has broken down. It wasn't big enough. We had left out God. Faith that is to be victorious must be faith in God, and must keep her eyes on *God*. We have misunderstood what faith in God is and does. Faith believes things about God which give our minds a place to rest. But she goes on to faith in a Person, not in statements about a Person: Can faith give the human spirit a sense of final security—that it will be safe even though loved ones, possessions, and life itself be lost?
>
> Beauty helps to maintain faith in God. Beauty is of ultimate and final value. Humour makes faith buoyant. Humour is of God. God often works so slowly that we lose faith if we have no patience. Hope is not anæmic, but a vital ally of faith. Things provable cannot keep up with faith, which soars on wings; but reason, testing every inch of ground, gives faith her taking-off ground for flight. The importance for faith of the solid ground of truth.
>
> We need faith restored by a vision of the eternal Church. Then we can recapture faith in a Church of altered method and approach. Can *Christian* faith in and through the Church make a contribution to the new age?

REMINISCENCES OF SIXTY-FIVE YEARS.

By The Rev. J. Pugh Perkins.

As a boy I went to Silcoates School in 1870 when Dr. Bewglass was Headmaster. He had graduated at the North of Ireland University, where his class-mate was the celebrated Lord Chancellor Cairns. Cairns was a strong Tory but a fine Christian man who taught a young men's class when he was Attorney-General of England. Bewglass did not attempt to disguise his pride that he was superior to Cairns in the Classical School.

At Rotherham College my Principal was Dr. Falding, who excelled in sermon class and was very critical of phraseology. On one occasion—this would be 60 years ago—a student used the phrase "in the midst". "Where is your midst?" exclaimed Falding. "My midst is here", added the Principal, indicating the abdominal region. At another time a student who was himself a spiritless preacher criticized another student for the dullness of his sermon. "Set a thief to catch a thief", was Falding's pertinent comment.

James Parsons of York preached my ordination sermon. He was getting old and his voice was weak, so he wrote declining the invitation. But I said: "Won't you come and help a young minister just beginning his work?" He replied, "I did not think I ought to come, but your importunity (see *Lk.* 11^{8}) has determined me otherwise". He was a very solemn man but had a human touch. Once when the College Board was sitting, we students were making a great noise; Parsons opened the door and said to us: "Gentlemen, you can be heard considerably, and I should like to say, *Go on with it*. But we have to think of the Committee".

When I was still a student in college, I went to preach one Sunday at St. George's Road, Bolton, and I was called upon to read a letter from a student of Airedale College, accepting the pastorate. That student was Charles Berry, later of Wolverhampton. When the Norfolk Union held its annual meetings at Chapel-in-the-Field, Norwich, I wrote asking Berry to come to speak, and he came. A fee was handed him, but he returned it saying, "I have come to serve your Union and why should I take a fee?"

During my time in college, Dr. Raleigh was at Masborough Chapel, and he came to dine one Monday in college, where a curious coincidence in ages was revealed. Our classical professor confessed that he was 54. Raleigh said that he was 55. And Falding added, "And I am 56!" Raleigh published a beautiful book, *The Quiet Sanctuary*. It was a course of sermons on Esther,

and was notable alike for its clear thinking and charming English.

Enoch Mellor, of Halifax, was near me in my early days at Ossett. His handshake was hearty and he wielded an immense power over Yorkshire audiences. He opened the new church at Horbury, by preaching on the words: "One thing I know, whereas I was blind, now I see". Another powerful sermon of his was from the words, "The veil of the temple was rent in twain, from the top to the bottom". His oratory was forceful and penetrating. He was a keen Liberationist, and a favourite lecture of his was on the topic, "Why we are Nonconformists". When Dale was absent from his Carrs Lane pulpit in his younger days, no man made a deeper impression as a supply than Mellor of Halifax.

I heard him many times at Carrs Lane. As a boy of about 16, I was allowed by my father to go over to Queen Street, Wolverhampton, to hear him deliver his chairman's address to the Union. His subject was the Holy Spirit in the different ages, and his words made a deep impression on my life.

Dr. Barrett was a close colleague of mine in Norwich, where they called him "the little saint". When he was invited to Kensington he consulted J. J. Colman, the mustard manufacturer, who replied succinctly, "Do you know when you are happy?" Barrett did; so he stayed among his friends at Norwich. Barrett received a great number of invitations, and was a close favourite of Dr. Hannay. When I suggested that the Norfolk and Suffolk Unions should unite one year for their Spring meetings, Barrett opposed the idea, but my resolution was carried, and the experiment has been repeated since. Barrett was a strong-willed man, but he could speak a cheering word to a younger minister, and he once greatly encouraged me by saying to me after an address I had delivered, "I should be sorry for anyone who could not get some good out of your address tonight".

Dr. Parker used to come down to Worthing in my time there, to see his great friend George Snashall, at whose house I would meet him at tea. I met him also at the Free Church Council meetings at Brighton when year after year Sir Joseph Compton-Rickett invited us to be his guests at the Hotel Metropole. One year Munro Gibson came, another Hugh Price Hughes, and Ian Maclaren and Parker in other years. Parker was very cordial, but he was very tired and asked to retire early. His life was then drawing to an end. One of his Thursday morning sermons burnt itself into my memory, when he preached on "Now I know". It was the story of Peter let out of prison and the angel guarding him through the open gates. He spoke of the things we do not know at the time they are happening. I had just returned from my first visit to Switzerland, and looking at my watch I thought I had time to reach the City Temple. Parker rose and said, "You may have

been to the Alps. You have seen wonderful scenery. You are bewildered. You wonder why you went. Wait till the dull November days. Then you will know". Dr. Clifford once told me that ten leading preachers were sitting together at table: Parker said the least, but what he said was the most original of all.

D. L. Moody came to Norwich specially to meet Christians. In the Agricultural Hall we had a very early Sunday morning meeting and sang the hymn, "More holiness give me". He appealed most impressively to Christian workers, and afterwards I went on to conduct the service at my own church, which led to a Roman Catholic woman deciding for Christ. This was due to the great incentives of Moody on that occasion. I heard him preach again in Leeds and Birmingham on the New Birth with such a pleading voice, sometimes tremulous with emotion. Some said he was monotonous in intonation, but I never thought so. He had, of course, a blunt style and a Yankee accent. I remember Sankey singing "Nothing but leaves" with a touching sweetness which is unforgettable. I can never fail to remember how he sang "There were ninety and nine that safely lay in the shelter of the fold". Moody could never have done so great a work without Sankey. They laboured splendidly together, and I have always been thankful that my ministry was launched on the Moody and Sankey revival.

Herber Evans I twice visited at his house in Caernarvon. He was an elephantine, gigantic man, broadset and heavy, but with a tender voice whose tones melted the people to tears. I was once staying at Conway, and walked over to Penmaenmawr where he was preaching. In the morning he spoke on "Let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me", and in the evening his text was "Let this mind be in you which is also in Christ Jesus". He first of all conducted a Welsh service and preached for 50 minutes in Welsh. Then, after pausing for half-an-hour, he preached for 50 minutes in English.

I shook hands once with Henry Ward Beecher at his Tabernacle at Brooklyn, New York. We stayed to communion, and afterwards he stood in front of the communion pew to greet visitors. "A number of us would like to see you in England", I said. "There's the ocean to cross, and I'm not fond of that", he smilingly replied. Later he came to us at Norwich and gave a memorable lecture on "The Misfits of Life".

Again and again I met Hugh Price Hughes. He was in favour of the Boer War, and at the time it was being waged a number of us were staying with him at a hotel and were at supper together. I happened to be his chief opponent on this occasion and on the subject of the war. Hughes loved a debate, and he liked to see a

man stand to his guns. He was a big-hearted brother and a great soul.

Ambrose Shepherd was in college with me and we were close friends. He once said to me, "Some of my fellow-students have never had their due, but I think that I have had more than my due". This was a modest expression of opinion, seeing that at that time long queues were lining up outside his church in Glasgow. He had intense social passion in the pulpit, and exhausted himself in his preaching. In college no one ever thought he would attain distinction, for at that time he read fiction extensively. But he developed later and mastered himself, and he seemed to wake up and come into his own at Reading. "Glasgow may be my Waterloo", he said as he accepted Elgin Place. He was a very keen politician, and this drew out his power. He was an ardent Protestant and a thing that almost broke his heart was the diversion of some members of his family to Romanism. In his application of Christian truth to current themes he was a genuine prophet. Henry Batchelor had a crowded church before him, yet who knows his name today? Very few of the names of even the most eminent preachers survive more than one generation, but Dale and Parker will certainly live.

Of the older giants one has just a few fleeting memories. I once heard J. C. Harrison, the great friend of Stoughton and Allon, preach on the Holy Spirit with astonishing power. Dr. Bruce I knew, and prayed with him on his death-bed; he passed away in the height of the New Theology controversy, and was much distressed concerning it. Macfadyen preached the first sermon of the opening of our new church at Ossett. In Manchester he was the friend of Alexander McLaren, and he told me how depressed McLaren easily became because of what he regarded as an insufficient number of conversions. I once had a chat with Dr. Newth in the Memorial Hall reading room. He was on the New Testament Revision Committee, over which Bishop Westcott presided. Newth suggested in regard to the miracle of the loaves that the word "fragments" should be replaced by "broken pieces", and Westcott supported this, and it was adopted.

On one occasion Baldwin Brown was unable to preach a special sermon, and Dr. Allon took his place. On the Underground railway afterwards I asked Guinness Rogers how he liked the sermon. "I prefer clear light to the mist", was his laconic comment. In early days I was at a morning session in the City Temple of the Congregational Union when a distinguished-looking man went on to the platform and there was a sudden silence. "Who is that?" I whispered. "Baldwin Brown", was the reply. He wrote magnificent historical articles and was very widely read; indeed I preferred his writings to his sermons. Concerning him a friend

once said to me: "He is a very clever man, but I wish he would not take so many books with him into the pulpit, that he may quote from them during the sermon".

Newman Hall opened Magdalen Road Church, Norwich; his voice was magical, and he preached on "A Sanctuary and a Prison". He told how Paul and Silas were prisoners of the Lord, and that they sang songs in the night in prison. He then sang aloud in the pulpit the words:

> The Lord is my refuge and strength,
> A very present help in trouble.

He then described how the prisoners heard them and listened. And again he sang in the pulpit, this time the words:

> The Lord is my Shepherd,
> I shall not want.

No one who heard it could ever forget that sermon.

Samuel Martin was a spiritual genius and a great friend of Dean Stanley, who would say to visitors, "I will take you to see the Angel of Westminster". He took them to see Samuel Martin. Martin would go and sit in the different pews at Westminster Chapel and lift his heart in prayer for the family that sat there on Sundays. He was one of the old saints.

Of those who have more lately passed from us, J. H. Jowett I knew well. We were at Matlock together when he had received the call to America. "Some are reproaching me", he said to me, "for going to a Presbyterian Church, but there is little difference, and I am ready to be a Presbyterian".

Wardlaw Thompson I loved. He was a true statesman and would plead with deep earnestness for the L.M.S. Forward Movement. He insisted upon the importance of training native teachers, and was not in favour of keeping stations mainly dependent on European missionaries. He was not keen to start new missions at too great a distance from central points, lest the work be crippled or lost. When a crisis had arisen and we were inclined to withdraw from some field, Wardlaw Thompson would bring in Elkanah Armitage or Arnold Thomas to exhort the Board to have more faith, with the result that the resolution for withdrawal would be defeated.

I heard Spurgeon at Brunswick Chapel, Leeds, and all were deeply moved when in his tender voice he quoted the verse of Cowper:

> E'er since by faith I saw the stream
> Thy flowing wounds supply,
> Redeeming love has been my theme
> And shall be till I die.

It was a morning service on a week-day in 1879, but the church was

crowded. What a lovely voice he had, and what a winner of souls he was!

Dr. McLaren, of Manchester, preached in Sheffield at the opening of a new Baptist church in 1873, and I went over from Rotherham College to hear him. He began thus: "And he called unto him Twelve—and concerning most of them we hear nothing again". It was a sermon appealing for earnestness and condemning coldbloodedness. I later heard him again at the opening of a church at Coseley, near Wolverhampton, where he gave the same sermon, and I was very glad to hear him once more and get another inspiration.

F. B. Meyer I greatly liked. I recall speaking with him at Romsey, where he spent the time before the meeting writing an article. In practical matters relating to the Christian life he was the best all-round man with whom I ever talked. He was an idealist and had a very high ideal of what a minister should be. In Bradford he once gave us ministers a most drastic talk on social purity. He was very responsive in little things, and if another man's prayer had moved him, he would thank him for it. When I once consulted him about the pastorate of a certain church, he said, "I do not know that it is my province to advise you, but I suggest this question to you—Can you be most useful there?"

Dr. Clifford was a closer friend of mine than any of the other leaders. He was a little man in stature, but as he spoke and became more and more impassioned, up went his hand, and he seemed to grow bigger and bigger. I, like him, was a Passive Resister and refused to pay tribute for teaching in Roman Catholic schools a doctrine in which we did not believe. He was my guest at Worthing, and we often discussed together the problems of church life, politics, and the sacred cause of peace. We agreed that this country could not have kept out of the 1914-1918 war, and we were also at one in being strong Liberationists. I often used to go and see him in his last days at Ealing, and we would sit together overlooking the valley and engage in calm and happy converse. One of the last things the old warrior told me was how much, as an octogenarian, he had enjoyed writing an article on "The Zest of Life"!

WHY CHRISTIAN MISSIONS?

By the Rev. H. V. Martin, M.A., B.D.

The great British Missionary Societies were founded in an age when the missionary understanding of Christianity was far different from what it is now. From Zinzendorf to Schweitzer there has been a radical change in the Protestant conception of Christianity which has inevitably altered the justification of Christian Missions and the method of presentation of the Gospel in actual missionary work.

The main religious force which led to the founding of the British Missionary Societies at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries was that of Pietism. This in general was an emotional reaction against the rigid and deadening intellectualism which had set in after the more living age of the Reformation. As against the orthodox stress upon the rightness of doctrine as the essential in Christianity, Pietism stressed the cultivation of the inner spiritual life in communion with Jesus. By deeper devotion, prayer, and renewed study of the Bible, the Pietists sought to separate themselves from the world and the worldliness of the Church. Their general outlook was narrow, often bigoted; but there was an intensity of religious fervour about them which contrasted favourably with the cold worldliness of more orthodox circles.

It was largely this tense, narrow, uncompromising religious fervour which led to the commencement of the Protestant Missionary effort. Christianity was held to be the one true, divinely-revealed religion for all mankind. All other religions were false and of the Devil. Christ was the only way of salvation, and all who died without faith in Him were doomed to perdition. A second personal advent of Jesus was eagerly expected, but before that great event the Gospel must be preached in all the world. The main justification for Christian Missions was thus found in the great command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel"; and with commendable zeal and heroic self-sacrifice these men set out on the tremendous task of the evangelization of the world for Jesus.

But the same period which led to the birth of the Foreign Missionary enterprise had given rise also to the French Revolution with all that it signified. The Feudalism of the Middle Ages was giving way to the modern capitalistic system. There arose the belief in the inevitable progress and evolution of the human race, and all that is implied in the philosophy of Humanism. The

Christian outlook was inevitably affected, and thus there began also that movement called Christian Liberalism, which came into conflict with Pietism.

Though the Foreign Missions started under the impulse of Pietism was still carried on by Christian Liberalism, its justification had to be changed and methods of presentation of the Gospel reconsidered. Much that was false in Pietism was criticized and condemned, such as the insistence on the verbal inerrancy of the Bible. Pietistic individualism was replaced by a right emphasis upon the Church as the sphere of the Word of God. Christian Liberalism was based upon a wider culture, in close touch with modern philosophy. Pietism was other-worldly, but tended to make men look inwards instead of upwards, and to stress their own experiences as the ground of their acceptance by God rather than the act of God Himself.

But Christian Liberalism, in spite of the valuable work it performed, was essentially a perversion of the Gospel. Its basic presupposition of the inevitability of human progress, taken from Humanism, led it to deny any radical sinfulness in human nature. The supernatural element in the Gospel was practically banished, and the uniqueness of Christianity in relation to other religions was confused. In these points, Liberalism was far and away less Christian than Pietism, and it has had on the whole a depressing effect upon Christian Missionary effort. To understand this effect, we have to consider three outstanding theological figures of the 19th century.

Schleiermacher.

The whole of 19th century theology in the West was influenced by Schleiermacher's theology of experience. He attempted to restate Christianity, not as hitherto, on the basis of an objectively-given revelation, but as an explication of human experience. He asserted that the root of all religion is the feeling of absolute dependence upon some supra-mundane power, a feeling experienced by man in his deepest moments as God-consciousness. The various world religions have arisen as attempts to understand and fulfil this God-consciousness, and revelation can thus be spoken of only as the emergence of religious truth in the human mind under the influence of the Divine indwelling. The whole emphasis is upon God as immanent; religion becomes mysticism based upon a monistic philosophy; between man and God, reason and revelation, nature and grace, there is continuity and not opposition.

It is true nevertheless that Schleiermacher wanted to present Christianity as the supreme religion, in the sense that it manifests Christ as the great Redeemer by whose influence it becomes pos-

sible for man to master the lower forces of his sense-consciousness, and become more and more God-conscious. But Schleiermacher's actual Christology is obscure; the unique Deity of Christ is not stressed, but He is pictured rather as the Ideal Man, the Archetype of Humanity, in whom the God-consciousness fully controlled the sense-consciousness so that He was without sin. Schleiermacher makes no radical or absolute distinction between Christianity and other religions, but rather conceives the relationship as that between the perfect and the imperfect, the complete and the partial, the fruit and the bud.

Ritschl.

Ritschl criticized the undue subjectivism of Schleiermacher and attempted to get back to an objectively-given revelation of God in Jesus Christ. He found this not so much in the Bible as in the historic personality of Christ, in His life and work and teaching, and especially in His manifestation of the principle of love. This objective revelation, however, has to be judged and valued solely by its capability of religious appropriation, and translation into terms of religious experience. In this way Ritschl attempts to get over the difficulty of the subjective appropriation of a revelation objectively given.

There are two weak points in this line of thought. Firstly, by making the subjective the criterion of the objective in revelation, Ritschl ultimately destroys the validity of the objective, since he will not allow any independent metaphysic upon which the objective can be based. Secondly, the historic personality of Christ will not bear the weight which Ritschl puts upon it, since modern Biblical criticism shows that the question of the nature of Christ's personality was not uppermost in the minds of the Gospel writers, and the records themselves are obscure and uncertain at vital points.

Ritschl does not deal directly with the relationship of Christianity to other world religions, and thus we can only proceed by inference. His intention is certainly to show Christianity as the unique revelation of Divine redemption, but his failure to substantiate the objective element in that revelation, and his false emphasis upon the historic personality of Christ, together with his rejection of the apocalyptic and supernatural elements in the Gospel, have led to a distortion of the New Testament witness to the uniqueness of Christianity in relation to other religions.

Troeltsch.

Troeltsch represents that outlook prevalent at the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century, which in the understanding of Christianity stresses the importance of the philosophy and psychology of religion, and the history of religions.

Ritschl based his theology upon the objectively-given revelation in the historical Jesus; but Troeltsch argues that all history is relative and that therefore any revelation based upon history is also relative. The psychology of religion shows that religions have many common elements, and that, fundamentally, religious experience is one, in whatever religion it may be found. Religion itself is understood as the Divine Spirit's self-realization within humanity, and thus the history of religions is the witness to this developing process under the varying conditions of differing ages and peoples. The philosophy of religion stresses that each religion is but an individual form of religion itself, conditioned by historical and psychological accidents. Therefore, there can be no objective criterion by which any one religion can claim to be universally valid and final.

What then of Christianity? Schleiermacher pointed to Christianity as the final and universally valid fulfilment of all religions. Ritschl, again, indicated that the uniqueness of Christianity lies in its supreme degree of actualization, in the historic Jesus, of the moral end of God in the Kingdom of God on earth. Troeltsch swings further away again in denying any uniqueness in Christianity; since, though it may be claimed from the Western standpoint to be a higher form of religion than others, it may not be so for other peoples; and, in any case, it may have to give way in the course of history to some more perfect form of religion. In no sense can there be any question of final validity.

Upon the actual Mission Field the theological movement from the Pietism of the late 18th century to the historical relativism of Troeltsch is interesting and instructive. To a surprising extent, Pietism and Fundamentalism have persisted, especially in a number of smaller Missions and amongst illiterate and semi-illiterate Christians. But the missionaries of the larger Missions and the educated leaders of the Younger Churches have been strongly affected by the theological trends in the West. This becomes clear when we examine the method of presentation of the Gospel in relation to other religions. Three main attitudes taken may be noted:

(1) *Christianity as the Fulfilment of all Religions.*

This attitude takes its rise in the main from the thought of Schleiermacher. Accepting the notion of an essence of religion based upon a common God-consciousness within the soul, the advocates of this view hold that there are common elements in all religions which should be a bond between all religious men, and upon which a common religious understanding may be built. Christianity therefore should not oppose other religions as altogether wrong, but should present itself as their fulfilment. Christ

offers in fullness and finality what other religions have only in part and in distortion. In the light of Christianity the dimly apprehended truths of other religions can be brought to clearness and fruition.

This is, in the main, the attitude taken in J. N. Farquhar's *Crown of Hinduism* (1915), which, according to Dr. MacNicol, initiated a new missionary era. Dr. Farquhar writes:

> All the gleams of light that make Hindu faith and worship so fascinating to the student, find in Him (Christ) their explanation and consummation. . . . Christianity is the Crown of Hinduism.

The influence of Schleiermacher upon Dr. Farquhar is even clearer in the following:

> There is a certain underlying unity in all religions . . . there is something which links the lowest religion to the highest . . . there is an identity which persists through the myriad forms which religion takes . . . there has never been a religion that did not uplift men, that did not bring them nearer God . . . through his gross religion, the savage can reach God . . . through the grossest religion, there is a path to God . . . Christianity frankly acknowledges that a man may be acceptable to God in any religion.

Rudolf Otto has a somewhat similar thought in *The Idea of the Holy*. He writes:

> No religion has brought the mystery of the need for atonement or expiation to so complete, so profound, or so powerful expression as Christianity. And in this too, it shows its superiority over others. It is a more perfect religion, and more perfectly religion than they, in so far as what is potential in religion in general becomes in Christianity a pure actuality.

This type of attitude was very prevalent during the first quarter of this century on the Mission Field, and amongst the older missionaries it still persists. Much effort is spent in showing how various doctrines in other religions are more perfectly expressed in Christianity, and how man's religious needs, met, it is admitted, in measure in these other religions, are fully satisfied in Christ.

(2) *Christianity as the Influence of the Personality of Christ.*

The presentation of the Gospel as the explanation and consummation of all other religions did not meet with the practical success that was anticipated. It seemed very plausible to the Western mind, but to the Easterner savoured of the usual Western arrogance. Christianity might satisfy the needs of the West, but Eastern religions were more fitted for the people of the East. Mahatma Gandhi sums up the attitude by saying, "Every nation's religion is as good as any other. Certainly India's religions are adequate for her people".

Moreover, this attitude of Christian missionaries leaves them with no appeal for decision. It is just a matter for preference whether Christian doctrines or Confucian doctrines, for example, best satisfy the individual. This weakness led to a greater stress upon the personality of Christ as the essence of the difference between Christianity and other religions, and then the appeal is to accept Christ in place of other religious figures. This attitude owes much to Ritschl. Christianity, it is said, is Christ, and therefore we must present Christ as He lived among men, as He taught, and above all, as He died in love for mankind. The expectation is that when non-Christians see Christ thus in His moral and religious grandeur they will feel drawn to follow Him, and will join the society of those who, by accepting His teaching, form the Kingdom of God on earth.

This position may be illustrated from the words of Dr. Stanley Jones[1]:

> When I first went to India, I was trying to hold a very long line—a line that stretched clear from *Genesis* to *Revelation*, on to Western civilization, and to the Western Christian Church. I found myself bobbing up and down that line, fighting behind Moses and David and Jesus and Paul and Western civilization and the Christian Church. I was worried. There was no well-defined issue. I found the battle almost invariably being pitched at one of these three places, the Old Testament, or Western civilization, or the Christian Church. I had the ill-defined but instinctive feeling that the heart of the matter was being left out. Then I saw that I could and should shorten my line, that I could take my stand at Christ, and before that non-Christian world refuse to know anything save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

Such an attitude sounds very Christian, but it has serious defects. The Christ thus to be presented, divorced from the Old Testament and the Christian Church, is certainly not the Christ of the Gospels, but the Christ of Christian Liberalism, of whom Schweitzer truly wrote[2]:

> The Jesus of Nazareth who appeared as Messiah, proclaimed the ethic of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, and died in order to consecrate His work, has never existed. This is a figure which was drawn by rationalism, animated by Liberalism, and clothed in an historical garment by modern theology.

(3) *Christianity as Parallel to other Religions.*

Once the uniqueness of Christianity is surrendered, or its nature falsely described, its superiority also will soon be questioned. Troeltsch, as we have seen, argues for the relativity of all religions,

[1] *Christ of the Indian Road*, 16.
[2] *The Quest of the Historical Jesus.*

and this attitude also has permeated some sections of the Mission Field. It is openly maintained that Christianity in the face of other religions must not assert any superiority of any kind. If religion be taken as a common aspiration by man after God, a common search after the deepest truths of existence, and a common apprehension of the Divine within the totality of human experience, however dim and historically conditioned that may be, then, as is argued in *Rethinking Missions,* "the relation between religions must take increasingly hereafter the form of a common search after truth". This means that all religions must be conceived as parallel developments of the human spirit's apprehension of the Divine, individualizations of Religion itself. In Bernard Lucas's words:

> All of them from the crudest to the most refined are a part of that consciousness of the Divine out of which man is evolving the true conception of God.

How far we have travelled from the days of Pietism can be seen from the following two quotations. Dr. Clifford Manshardt writes:

> The present-day view of religion as a natural process of development gives little ground for any religion regarding itself as superior *per se*. . . . Christianity now, instead of being a right to supplant a wrong, becomes a fellow-seeker along with other world religions.

That such an attitude is not a mere theoretical one, but is being translated in many quarters into practice, can be seen from the attitude of the Rev. Verrier Elwin, who wrote in the *Indian Social Reformer* in 1935:

> I live among the Ghonds and love them. I have never interfered with their religion, and when any of them ask me to make them Christians, I refuse. I think myself that it would be better for all to adopt a similar attitude of detachment and leave their ancestral faith alone.

We have now to consider the attitude of the Home Churches towards Foreign Missions at the present time. The really surprising thing is that, in spite of all the theological undermining of the original justification for Foreign Missions, these Missions have been carried on with a fair measure of support, and a real measure of success. The heart of our Home Churches is on the whole sound on the matter of Foreign Missions. There are indeed critics who ask whether it is really worth while working amongst the millions of Africa, China, and India who, if the theologians are to be believed, are happy in their ancestral faiths, and whom God, in His love, will eventually welcome, whether they come through Christ or through idols of wood and stone. But such critics are usually outside our Churches. The average minister, however much he may be influenced in his private thinking by Christian Liberalism,

still maintains a great interest in and often a surprising keenness for Foreign Missions. So also with the mass of Christian people; it is the impulse of the heart which is followed rather than the deliberation of the head. And in this matter the heart is right.

But my contention is that what is needed to-day is a sound theological justification for Christian Missions, based upon the best scholarship, and yet true to historic Christianity. I believe that a great and better day is coming for Christian Missions. A strong reaction against the Christian Liberalism of the last century is now setting in, and whatever name it may be given, it represents a more realistic and Biblical understanding of the Christian faith in its relation to other religions. If the Christian heart without the full support of the head could accomplish so much during the last century, what cannot be accomplished when the heart and the head are united in support of Foreign Missions?

The great defect in the 19th century Liberalism in relation to Foreign Missions was a false understanding of the nature of religion. Schleiermacher started this false line, that religion was common to all men, that rightly followed it was the highest development of man, and led straight to God and salvation. It is just here that the reaction has come. Barth, for instance, though he is willing to admit that religion is "the noblest, most necessary, most hopeful of all human possibilities", condemns it in the end as the supreme impossibility. Man can never reach God through religion. "Every claim to direct relationship with God made on its behalf is utterly worthless." Because of sin, man can never reach God; only God coming down to man can save him. Thus the 19th century stress on religion has now to be changed to the problem of revelation. It is here that the uniqueness of Christianity stands out. Christianity stands before all world religions with a claim to the unique revelation of the Word of God in Jesus Christ. All other revelation is negative and leads only to condemnation. The revelation to which Christianity points is positive and it alone leads to salvation.

It is as witnesses to this unique, supreme, and Divine revelation that missionaries are called to go forth to the ends of the earth. It is the real concern of the Church to witness to this redemption revealed through the Scriptures and manifested in Jesus Christ. There can be no separation of Church and Mission. To quote Barth:

> If the Church has heard the Word of God, then it has a Mission, something to say which man must hear, and it cannot be silent.

There can be no compromise with other religions, nor acknowledgment of other so-called revelations. On the other hand, it is only against the background of other religions and other revelations

that the uniqueness of Christianity can be understood. The missionary method must be to show how impossible it is to reach God through other religions, and that the Gospel alone gives the answer to the problem which religion raises but can never answer, namely, the problem of man's total existence.

It may be difficult for Christians in the West to see the missionary situation clearly and in perspective in these days of war. There will be every temptation to concentrate on the Home Front and forget the wider frontiers of Christ's kingdom far away. But such temptations must be resisted. The world is not Europe. Europe may perish in conflagration and disaster, but the world will still go on. It may yet be in the Providence of God that where the West has failed the East may in a better measure succeed. The issue between Christian revelation and human religion is now a clear-cut issue in the West. The final fruit of human religion is to be seen in Nazi-ism. That out of this turmoil a stronger, more vital, even if a more compact, Church will emerge I have no hesitation in believing.

Meanwhile, let there be a growing wave of missionary enthusiasm, an enthusiasm not only of our hearts, but one based upon a new and deep understanding of the place of the Christian Gospel amongst the religions of the world, both old and new.

Most ministers and students are on the look-out for a bargain, and we trust none of them have missed Mr. Ramsay Muir's **Civilization and Liberty* (Cape, 2s. 6d.), which the publishers are only able to sell at this absurdly cheap price because of a grant from the Association for Education in Citizenship. It would be an impertinence to criticize Mr. Ramsay Muir's history—we are sometimes tempted to regret that he ever forsook the teaching of history for politics—and all who follow him on this journey from the emergence of civilization to the present conflict between totalitarianism and democracy will learn much—and enjoy themselves in the process.

Mr. Charles Morgan's *The Voyage* (Macmillan, 9s.) is perhaps his best piece of work to date—and it is one which ought to be read by all concerned with the problem Dr. C. J. Cadoux and Mr. Angus Watson discuss in our pages. Once we get over the fact that the village maiden far too suddenly begins to talk like the dramatic critic of *The Times* we can settle down to watch how Barbet and Thérèse separately and together set out on the voyage. Mr. Morgan has already discussed the quest for interior peace and the effect on it of the relations between man and woman. Here, in the study of these two characters, outwardly so unlike yet inwardly of the same stuff, he returns to the problem—and his book is rewarding. Some of the minor characters are skilfully sketched in.

OURSELVES AND OUR SCIENCE.

By the Rev. A. Graham Eldridge

Our moral and spiritual condition is now inseparable from our scientific progress. Just how they work together, or what influence the one may have upon the other, it is our duty to discover.

Some do not hesitate to declare that it is our science which has led us away from God, estranged us from His teaching, and given to our wills that excess of power which they are always demanding when we will not submit them to God's control. Hastly these people conclude that the world's tragic *débâcle* is just the result of science.

Every thoughtful person will realize that there is much that is confusing and untrue in such assertions, yet they still leave in the minds of many unaccustomed to clear thinking conflicting thoughts regarding the real value of our growing knowledge.

Such argument against science carried to its logical conclusion places a premium upon ignorance. The less we know the less we can sin. Give a man more power and he can do more evil. Limit his power and, however bad he may be, he will not become a major problem. This way and salvation lie in keeping human life pacified with the practices of pigmies instead of urging every man to develop the powers within himself.

In all these conflicting ideas are we not guilty of dividing man into two separate selves? First we speak of man's moral and spiritual self, and then of his scientific mind. But the mind is equally the cause of both our moral and spirtual condition, as it is also the cause of our scientific progress. We have but one conscious mind, and it is of the nature of the Divine mind whereby we can think the thoughts of the Creator after Him.

Moreover, all that man discovers through his science is of God. No one but God has constituted the laws which govern His universe, and He alone is responsible for all natural phenomena. The mathematician and the chemist exist and work only because God is the supreme mathematician and chemist. God cannot be separated from His laws and His works.

And again, *nothing man has yet discovered by his scientific investigation has ever been harmful to him in the least degree.* The very contrary is true. Man's development every time, and at all times, depends upon his knowledge of God and God's works. The only reservoir of evil is the human mind. From this source harm and evil can be brought to any discovery, so that it is made to work for a wrong end. Mathematics and chemistry know nothing

of wrong and harmful purposes, any more than physics knows of laws ordained for evil. If this be not the truth, then God is guilty of creating an evil universe with evil intentions.

But is it not science which has given us the rapidly firing machine gun, the incendiary and high explosive bomb, and the gases which may yet feed the flames of this infernal fire of war before it dies down? No. Never. By patient striving and extreme care the fitter in the shop has learned to work to almost infinite precision. In his task he is helped by the long, arduous labours of many minds which have provided him with instruments fascinatingly delicate, and minutely true in all their service. An error of a ten-thousandth of an inch is so serious that it meets instant condemnation. The mechanic applies his genius to the making of the complicated mechanism of the fuse and the percussion cap of a bomb. The chemist prepares ingredients according to a previously prepared formula and the physicist decides the stresses, strains, and curvatures of the casing. All this is the application of science to a particular end, but it is not pure science. Man can and does make bombs. God could, but does not.

But is it for our good that we should know all that we do know to-day? Is it to our highest advantage that we can do what we can do now? Yes, very definitely. God cannot lead His earthly children on to that great Kingdom which He is preparing for them in His love and wisdom, without allowing them the experience of a great scientific age. He treats man as His son. "Sons of God" is at once our holiest and greatest calling. Already the wealth of new life and new meaning which has been bestowed upon the world during the past one hundred and thirty years is immeasurable. Long before the scientific age has spent itself, wonders and wealth and achievement will bless the people of God to an extent undreamed of at this moment.

Rather then than fear or condemn our science, we must learn to interpret its meaning, and use its power to the advancement of the race. And here we begin with our real difficulty. The mind of man is still desperately wicked. Again we repeat, man can and does make bombs. God could, but does not. The basic problem of this great age lies in its mentality, and not in its science.

Ruin has come upon the world because men have wilfully dethroned God, and then used His gifts of modern enlightenment to carry out their devilish enterprises. It has come to be that the most formidable foe that Christ has to meet in His world is not ignorance, but His own gracious enlightenment, seized, distorted, and dishonoured, and so misused until it is opposed to everything which He taught, and for which He lived and died. Earlier oppositions, venting themselves in persecutions, had neither the

strength, nor the mental ability, to damage the whole structure and spirit of Christianity as this mighty anti-christ now has. It is man with the powers of God who defies God, and who by the wheels of his mechanized chariots haughtily churns in the dust the most cherished hopes of the human race.

This agonizing calamity has struck the world when men and women everywhere were loosening the bonds which bound them to their Lord. Christian practice was all too often punctuated by indolence and ease, not only in ordinary life but in those circles which might have been most instrumental for Christian advance. Our hesitation to accept and apply the teachings of Jesus is reflected in church attendance throughout this entire country. While church attendance is not everything, it is indicative of the people's central thought and devotion.

In deep penitence, we of the Churches must admit that we have not applied the teaching of Jesus to this scientific age. We have been content to use old formulæ, old customs, and even such old phrases in our speech that the Gospel message has seemed obsolete. The vitality of our evangel has gone from our services. We have not made Christ the eager hound of heaven trailing the footsteps of the unsettled thinker and worker until he has heard Christ's voice saying:—

> All which thy child's mistake
> Fancies as lost, I have stored for thee at home:
> Rise, clasp My Hand, and come.

Our task must be seen in a new light. We have got to match the message of Christ's gospel to this age, or witness paganism dethrone Christianity, and that in countries where for centuries Christ has reigned in the hearts and lives of the people. Such a vital application of Christianity will mean revolution in Church, State, and individual living. But so will paganism mean a revolution, and of a kind we dare not think of. In this awful hour the forces of Christianity must take the offensive if paganism is to be overthrown.

The world's torture will one day cease. God will not allow all to be lost. Another day will dawn for His children and for His world. The human race will have another opportunity. Restoration will be possible. Yes, but how? Only through the same powers that have caused the destruction. At that day, we shall need all our scientific skill and knowledge to rebuild civilization, and the clearer gifts of modern enlightenment to create new thoughts and new ideas to govern the new world order. Then may we learn the lesson of the world's misfortune, and know that the gifts of God are intended to lead us to repentance, that thereby we may reverence them, and use them only to His glory.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

THE CHURCHES OF SOUTH WALES.[1]

The thing that must be remembered all the time is that our Area is very extensive—it covers six counties and contains districts that differ greatly: there are the Towns, the Industrial Valleys, and the Agricultural Areas.

In the Towns we have some strong and some waning causes—waning because they

(*a*) lack leadership, or
(*b*) have become down-town and isolated, or
(*c*) are not needed as they are, but might be used effectively as religious social centres.

In the Valleys we have some excellent churches and a few struggling ones. All the Valley churches have suffered as a result of

(*a*) The Long Depression,
(*b*) The Continual Migration,
(*c*) The Spirit of the Age,
(*d*) The War.

Still, there are very few churches in the Valleys that I could say are not wanted or are not fulfilling a need. Some of them are very weak—weak in leadership, but also weak financially. The result is that they cannot afford a settled pastor, and consequently they seek *cheap supplies* and depend more and more upon an uneducated ministry. *That is fraught with great danger for the future.* It lowers the tone and the mentality of the churches and is bound to alienate the more educated.

The Agricultural Areas are a problem. They have been depopulated by migration to the towns, and the churches, therefore, have been decimated. *We are becoming weaker and weaker in the Agricultural Areas,* and the grouping of the churches may become a peril rather than a help *if* the minister has more than about two churches to look after.

What does all this mean in terms of denominational aid? First, that the denomination ought to appoint a *Commission* of two or three who would be prepared to give their time and talent to examine the situation and *to tell*

[1] This memorandum was prepared as a guide for the Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in preparation for a visit to the South Wales Churches in the month of October. It proved so helpful that we obtained Mr. Penry Thomas's permission to print it as it stood.—EDITOR.

the County Unions definitely, that in view of their findings they cannot henceforth feel justified in recommending the Central Fund to continue certain grants.

(2) That certain churches should not be aided unless they link up with certain weak neighbouring churches.

(3) That other churches should be encouraged to group and carry on without grants.

(4) That certain pastorates must be aided in order to maintain a Free Church witness in the district.

(5) That certain grants be lowered. *Sometime ago it looked as if South Wales was in for a short prosperous time.* The pits were going full steam ahead, and many of the young colliers were retained in the valleys; but *the fall of France has changed everything.* The pits are now working part-time and the young colliers are being called up.

That will mean further depletion in the congregations and less financial resources. *Moreover, the "black-out" is causing many problems.* It lessens the size of congregations It not only causes a decline in attendances but a drop in the collections. It makes week-night activities difficult and prevents older people from attending in the evenings.

You may ask what the denomination has done locally to try and relieve or help!

(1) We have striven to help to wipe out the debts that were like a millstone around the necks of the churches; I am glad to say that through the Moderator's Fund £6,000 has been wiped out, and that has lightened the burden of certain churches tremendously.

(2) We contributed £397 last year to help to pay salaries.

(3) I have given my services on Sundays *free of charge* to over 40 of our weaker churches this year.

(4) I have been able through the generosity of personal friends *to pay for supplies for other churches.*

(5) We have organized the Deacons of the Rhondda into a Deacons' Fellowship which meets bi-monthly and deals with the problems of the districts.

(6) We have been able to assist ministers and to send parcels of books to others through the kindness of friends.

(7) We have assisted churches to keep their Guilds going and have given advice—at their request—to ministers and churches.

(8) We have had a Lay-Preachers' Class in the Rhondda, and some of the members thereof have passed the Denominational Examination and are helping the weaker churches.

The churches do not fail for the lack of encouragement and sympathy—but *they are the victims of economic circumstances over which they and the denomination have no control. The marvel is the spirit of these churches!* They never think of closing the doors!

By all sorts of devices they manage to make ends meet.

They depend on an unpaid ministry to a great extent. They see to repairs and decorations themselves. The women by their sewing guilds make enough money to pay for necessaries. Women clean the churches in turn.

They are confident that they have their mission and that they will be here after Hitler has passed hence. It is a joy to preach to them and enjoy

their fellowship. They are wide-awake and appreciate the spoken word and do not miss a point.

They look after the children and try to the best of their ability to keep the organizations going!

Many of them, it is true, depend on the loyalty and zeal of a few—but *what a glorious few*!—sacrificing their time—their service—their depleted wealth—upon the Church of God! There are still saints on the earth.

What about our churches and the Evacuees?

There is a welcome for them, but the Evacuees must take our churches as they find them. They are far more homely than the churches that many of them have left—and not so swanky! Children are looked after as if they belonged to the families, and I have heard dozens of them say that they didn't want to go home.

If you can encourage the Evacuees to throw in their lot heartily with these churches they won't lack a welcome. I heard from one of my old officers who had gone across the border for quietness, that he had been to one of our churches for the last three months and not a single soul spoke to him, *not even the minister*. Ichabod! The evacuees *will not find that here* if they attend the churches and throw off their reserve.

The coming of Evacuees will help an occasional church in the matter of numbers. *It does little more*. People cannot contribute to two churches.

Many children are hearing about Jesus Christ for the first time as a result of coming to these often maligned and despised Valleys.

What of tomorrow?

Well, a weaker church numerically; a poorer church financially; but a stronger church morally and in fellowship and in social service. If a Revival comes numbers will increase. *The War is driving the Church into realms of Service*—compelling it to forget the beating of its own pulse. It will call for more *devoted* pastors and enlightened *teaching* ministers.

J. Penry Thomas.

THROUGH FEDERATION TO REUNION.

The reunion of Protestant Christendom is a subject of wide interest at the present time. The topic is warmly debated both by those inside the various branches of the Church, and, often, very much more by those who stand aloof. Many and fervent are the prayers which Sunday to Sunday ascend to God in this regard. Yet it often seems that the best commentary on all these efforts is supplied by the well-known words of Omar Khayyam:

> Myself when young did eagerly frequent
> Doctor and Saint, and heard great argument
> About it and about; but evermore
> Came out by the same door as in I went.

We may reasonably ask, "Why is this so?" Is it because we feel that, in essence, the subject is one of purely academic interest? Surely not! It is a vital matter, urgently demanding solution, even though, when propounded, the solution may take some time to pass from theory into practice. Nor must we ever say that the basis of reunion is actually impossible of achievement, however much ideally it may be desired. For Canon Barry has warned us that "to despair of the possibility is atheism", since "with God all things are possible"—and surely nowhere more so than in the realm of the Church, which is "the Body of Christ".

The truth is that progress in this field is always slow and sometimes quite

imperceptible, because, though many strive, there are but few who seem to be at all sure about the sort of thing envisaged under "that blessed word" reunion. In vain pursuit of an abstract and colourless idea of numerical unity many have lost sight altogether of a far more practical and indeed far more Christian conception. In struggling to find the lowest common denominator which will solve the problems of every Church, many have failed to grasp that much more potent "spiritual oneness" which can be established on the firm basis of the apostolic dictum that "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit".

If we face the facts we must admit that at the present time this much canvassed "oneness" of organization, work, and worship is in practice impossible, even if proved to be desirable, which many would take leave to doubt. The truth is that for long years to come, thinking only of these islands, there will be the equivalent of Puritan and Arminian, High Anglican and Plymouth Brother, whatever the varied names by which they may come to be known. If we go beyond these shores the problem is so vastly intensified that again we may quote Canon Barry with the fullest approval —"there is no hope if we tie down Christianity to any particular form of outward expression or regard it as inextricably involved with the cultural values of the West".

It does not follow, however, that if there is no hope in this direction, therefore there is no hope at all. To quote a parallel case of direct importance for our argument. We dare not say that because final peace did not come through the League of Nations as constituted, therefore international peace and unity are for ever impossible. There may be other methods, yet to be tried, which will succeed in manipulating the same material (*i.e.*, the various nation-States) so as to achieve the desired end. Federal Union is such a method, now being proposed and urgently canvassed. It is certainly not within the scope of this article to discuss the implications of this latest panacea, but the example is deliberately chosen for the plain reason that there are great possibilities for the cause of Christian reunion in a direct application of sound Federal principles to the problems of the churches. Beginning from a basis of Federalism, it is possible to envisage at a not too distant date in the future the return of the one Church (in the truest sense) Holy and Catholic, and nearer than ever before to being without "spot or blemish or any such thing".

To go further in practical elaboration of this theory, it is perhaps possible to learn something of the work involved by a consideration of some of the main principles of the Federal Union movement as expressed by writers like Mackay, Streit, and Curry, based on the living examples of the U.S.A., Switzerland, and other federated States. For those then who may not be acquainted with the platform of this movement, here, briefly stated, are the main points of Federal Union—

(a) Union citizenship finding its organ of expression in a Union Parliament to be elected by manhood suffrage throughout all the participating countries.
(b) A Union defence force.
(c) A Union customs-free economy.
(d) A Union currency.
(e) A Union post and communications system.

At the same time, it is clearly to be understood that in matters of strictly internal policy each separate State is to be its own master.

No doubt this outline will seem at first sight far removed from the subject of the reunion of the Churches. Yet, if we are willing to approach the

matter in a more imaginative than literal frame of mind, distinct resemblances to established facts in the life of the Churches will be seen to appear, resemblances moreover in matters of such proved and practical value as to make us hopeful of even greater good to come through the deliberate, planned application of Federalism to the matter in hand.

Let us first stress the principle of internal autonomy. As will be argued later, in view of the application of the other principles, this need not be for all time "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence", but through Federalism we can afford to allow this diversity (at the beginning) and thereby bridge over that gap which for ever yawns between theory and practical application in any other reunion scheme. We can all start where we are, and roughly as we are, and we can start now, except in the case of the very few "isolationists", and the Federation would seek to win them, as Federal Union hopes to win opposed States, not by coercion but by a clear proof of the advantages accruing from the fellowship of those within the Union.

That important fact being plainly realized, let us turn to the first point mentioned above, *viz.*, Union citizenship finding expression in a Union Parliament. Think for a moment of such fine achievements as the Madras Conference, the Oxford Conference on Church, Community, and State, and the Amsterdam Youth Rally, to name only the most recent of many such noble ventures. These are already ecumenical movements, blue-prints for a Parliament of the Churches, or whatever name we may like to give to this representative gathering. Behind these meetings stand the various denominational and larger groupings. There are, for example, annual meetings of various denominations, Convocation meetings in the Anglican Church, and such noble movements as the United Churches in S. India and China. Through these delegates could be selected, perhaps in some such way as the Chairman of the Congregational Union, and the Parliament of the Churches could meet, not just occasionally as is the case with the ecumenical gatherings at present, but on a planned basis to consider all matters concerning the whole body of the Church. Cannot we change that which is now so near to being the very thing we need into that permanent body which could act with a prestige and a power even greater than that, for example, of the Assembly of the League of Nations? A smaller body elected from the Parliament (like the League Council) might well be formed to do just that work which Dr. Douglas Horton spoke about in his article "Towards a Christian World Community" in the last number of the *Congregational Quarterly*.

This worthy expression of the Church Universal would also be able to off-set the particularity allowed in the internal autonomy of the Churches, and would undoubtedly serve, over a period of time, to develop the universal consciousness as over against the particular, and along that road lies fundamental, worthwhile Christian unity.

The next point is "a Union defence force". Again, by the gift of imagination, we can see the bearing of this. It is often said that "the best form of defence is attack". The missionary work of the Churches represents their attacking forces; therefore let us talk of missions in a federated Christian Church. Here there are two important points to be borne in mind. First, one is reminded forcibly in our day of the bitter complaint of David Livingstone, who more than once wrote home drawing attention to the fact that while there were representatives of almost every Christian sect under heaven to be found herded together in ministering to the coastal areas, there were but few who had the Christian courage to go up-country to stake new claims for the Kingdom of God. Today, at home and abroad, this problem is far from solution. On the Mission Field attempts at solution have been made,

but at home little has been done. Yet if Federalism could be applied, however slowly, what a difference we could hope for. If from the Federal Parliament a definite planned suggestion for future progress in all areas could be put forward, with recommendations which would serve not only for a vast continent but also for placing new churches, *e.g.*, on Council housing estates, how much time, money, enthusiasm could be, we would not say saved, but more wisely expended in the service of the Kingdom. If it be argued, as it would be at first, that by this means the distinctive teaching of each Church would be lost if all missionaries and home evangelists worked under such a central authority, the obvious answer, though kindly meant, is "So much the better!", since thus we are solving the second point mentioned above. It is the question increasingly being raised by educated men and women at home, but more particularly abroad. Many on the Mission Field recognize that we must not attempt to lock up the future of the faith in any already established occidental mould. The East has its contribution to make, and needs an indigenous Christianity. Therefore if the missionaries worked under the "mandate" of the central, elected body, acting on such ideas, for example, as we may hope will come from Dr. Horton's group-study of the Doctrine of the Church, they would be the better able to speak more and more of what we might call the "fundamentals" of the faith. These then could be clothed in native dress, and ultimately, when fully grown, the Native Churches could bring the glory of the East to the deliberations of the Federal Parliament of the Churches. This may seem a foolish dream, but is at least preferable to the nightmare of our present haphazardness.

Other points can be developed in much the same way. For example, the suggestion of a Federal currency can well be applied to the financial side of the work of the various churches. Through Federalism, much could be done to release money, as well as men (as mentioned above), to extend the Kingdom to the uttermost parts of the earth. Further than that, as false autonomy faded, and the machinery of true "unity in diversity" was thereby strengthened, perhaps something could be done on a large scale to rectify the crying scandals connected with ministerial stipends, and all such matters which can only be solved on the largest possible lines. Other matters which could also be dealt with through some "ministry" of the central Parliament are those subsidiary yet important matters which can never be the perquisite of any denomination or national Church, but which must become the concern of all for the good of all. I refer, of course (leaving missionary work on one side now), to the vast problems of Christian education, temperance, and social welfare work, efforts after international peace, and all other works of mercy which engage the attention of the various Churches, with much waste and re-duplication of effort, yet could be done through the machinery of the Federated Churches with far greater speed and widespread effectiveness.

In Federalism there is thus a way through to reunion; how noble a consummation it would be if the Churches took this way, and at the same time as they set their own house in order, gave back to the world at large that stimulus towards true internationalism which is going to be so greatly needed when the present painful struggle comes to an end.

S. Myers.

Mme. Lucie Rauzier-Fontayne's *Monsieur Paul* (Lutterworth Press, 4s. 6d.) tells the story of the heroic Huguenot pastor, Paul Rabaut, who during the years of persecution after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes ministered to congregations "in the Desert".

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

A LONG WEEK-END.

In many ways this quarter has crawled along, for Londoners have been anxiously waiting the arrival—and departure—of the shortest day and the longest night. But to the editorial office it has been all too short, partly because enemy action obliged us to produce the last number twice, and partly because many train journeys have sadly reduced the number of hours in the sanctum. Thus it is that press day finds many books still to be read in days full of engagements.

What should "Life and Books" be about this quarter? There is the article on "Prefaces" mentioned on another page, or one on "The Ethics of Anonymity" which has long been on the stocks. But readers bombard me with requests for personal articles such as generally fill this feature of the journal; they say they "lighten the theology" or "balance the highbrow" of the other pages—and I am left to ponder whether they mean to be complimentary or the reverse! It will be long, however, before a Chairman of the Congregational Union finds himself in wartime with the strange collection of duties the denomination has imposed upon me, and therefore it may be well to describe a long week-end in the life of a Chairman-Editor.

Saturday morning came with a full programme in store. It was the eve of press day, but there were several long journeys before I should see home again, and packing was more of a problem than usual. If the seven or eight books suitable for the train were to go in, something must come out, and as the gas-mask seemed less likely to be useful than pyjamas it was jettisoned. A steel helmet unhappily could not suffer the same fate, as a night arrival in London was on the schedule. Even the bus ride to town in a morning is an adventure nowadays; one never knows how long it will take, or by what devious route we shall travel. On this morning the *détour* came just after leaving home, where a burst water main was flooding the highway. Two hours have now to be allowed if one is catching a train. Little more than one was needed this morning; it sufficed for *The Times* (the crossword looked much too difficult!) and a rather unexciting *Lit. Sup.*, and for the beginning of the American *Advance*, which the postman had brought. Of this paper, now a monthly incorporating many Congregational periodicals, an American divine once remarked, "I always begin with the 'Risibles' on the last page, and then read backwards with decreasing interest". The "Risibles" are sometimes very good. Here is one of this month's, but rather more than a "Risible":

> Said the Cynic: "I could have made a better world than this".
> Said the Sage: "That is why God put you here. Go to it".

Advance shows how American Christendom is disturbed by the same problems as trouble us at home. Theological students and others are declining to register for military service, irritated patriots are demanding that conscientious objectors be dismissed from employment, and so on. And Americans are hearing some straight talking from within their own borders. In this number Prof. A. J. Wm. Myers, whose books on religious education are not unknown in this country, reminds Americans that the "Cash and Carry Policy" has three implications:

1. Repudiation of any responsibility for the state of the world or for conditions as they exist. Yet every intelligent person knows that

no nation or person is exempt. For example, the attitude of the United States to the League of Nations and the World Court and her sale of essentials to Italy and Japan at war contributed markedly to the present world chaos.

2. Refusal to take any risk regardless of what human rights and ideals are at stake.
3. Demand for safe financial profits, without any risk, even if the world is afire.

From without citizens of the U.S.A. have been constantly plied with information by their British friends, as is exemplified in the volume I read on the first train journey, letters from husband and wife now published in F. Tennyson Jesse and H. M. Harwood's *London Front* (Constable, 12s.). The letters date from the end of August, 1939, to July, 1940, and the recipients were Americans well-known in the world of drama and letters—they included Dr. Edwin Hubble, the astronomer, and Sam Behrman and Alexander Woollcott. We regret to have to record that we much preferred the husband's letters to the wife's, which, if they are vivid when refugees from Belgium begin to arrive, become almost hysterical on Leopold's defection. And she finds that in the war we are paying for—whose sins, do you think?—Cromwell's, forsooth! Poor Oliver. Now, in addition to the thousands of castles he's blown to pieces and churches he's desecrated, he must bear the responsibility for Coventry Cathedral and the 98 damaged Congregational churches in London! H. M.'s letters are solid and sound; in the very first one (29 Aug., 1939) he says he hopes America will keep out of the war, and asks two things of the American people:

(a) That they don't allow their greedy traders to interfere with our blockade.

(b) That they don't start suggesting conciliation before we're well under way.

Shrewd cynicism often lends spice to his comments:

> In the spacious days of Queen Elizabeth political failures went to the block; now they just go to the House of Lords.

He makes a good point in arguing that if the British people are rather vague about what they are fighting *for*, they know perfectly well what they are fighting *against*, which is a more effective driving force. Perhaps the two most revealing sentences in the book are the statement that in 1937 President Roosevelt said to Mr. Justice Frankfurter, "It will take the American people about two-and-one-half years to see what this German business really is", and the young policeman's comment when Belgian exiles were relating their tragic stories, "Why, Miss, this is really serious. Why, this may happen to *us*".

As I compared my own American experiences with these letters, my journey drew to an end; I was only an hour late, which is not bad for these days. And then I found myself confronted with a situation which has not been mine very often—I was given not private hospitality, but that of an apartment house. Frequently in recent years I have heard older ministers lament the decay of hospitality, but that has not been my own experience; some of my happiest recollections and some of my warmest friendships are connected with homes whose gracious hospitality I have received, homes of people in all social classes and walks of life. Only twice have I had a really bad time; one was thirty years ago and one five, and if I still shudder at the thought of the first, I shiver at the thought of the second, a "private hotel" (save the mark!) where I tried to sleep on a bitter winter's night in

an overcoat, one blanket, and as far away from dirty sheets as I could get. In both these instances the churches could not possibly have known what provision they were making, and in both cases they were desirous of helping their own people. This week-end was nothing like those memorable two, though I am sure that philanthropy was again in the church's mind. But when plans of this kind are made, the visitor should be warned, and his suggestions asked, and this is all the more necessary when evacuees and billeting add to the difficulty of finding homes for preachers. There may be friends within reach with whom he would prefer to stay, or he may even desire to go to an hotel and meet the extra charges himself. I rather rejoiced when I realized the situation, thinking of the long hours when I could work free from social obligations; but the light in my room proved to be only 20 candle power, and when I went to bed the globe there was so enshrouded in dark green paper that I could get no light on my book. At last, by standing on the bed, I managed to pin back the paper—a dusty business, as it had evidently not been touched since September, 1939. And I thought how much better I could have worked had I paid a few extra shillings and gone to an hotel—with the same freedom, but with good lighting, notepaper, warmth, and ample hot water. Still, I managed to get through my next book, wondering as I opened it if the lack of gallantry which made me prefer husband to wife was becoming chronic, for it must be confessed that when I picked up Dame Katherine Furse's autobiography, *Hearts and Pomegranates* (Davies, 15s.)—much too big for bed reading—my first reaction was "What a whopper!" And yet it (400 pp.) has been cut down, and another volume is threatened. This one practically stops at 1918, after Mrs. Furse has become "Dame" in recognition of her admirable services in organizing the "V.A.D.s" and founding the "Wrens". Readers will, I think, find the first half of the volume fascinating. Katherine was the daughter of John Addington Symonds, and the picture of bohemian life in the invalid's home at Davos is full of colour. There visitors flocked—many of them invalids themselves—and one of them, Charles Wellington Furse, the artist, brother of the present Bishop of St. Albans, Katherine married, to have four happy, if hectic, years before he died, leaving her with two sons. Two of her sisters married Walter Leaf and W. W. Vaughan, while Furse's uncle was William Cory of Eton. These and other familiar names flit through the pages. Katherine's parents, having been unable to accept a dinner invitation of Edward Lear's, called upon him; he put his head out of a bedroom window, said he was not at home, and told them the menu of the dinner they had missed. Katherine, when six, was sent to call on Jowett; after long silence he said, "Now give me a kiss and you may go", and the child was left to find her howling way along Balliol passages. Jowett, by the way, told one of the Symonds girls that so long as she had read Boswell and could take a hand at whist she needed no further education; whether this was due to the Master's view of woman's place in the world or a tribute to the culture of the Symonds' *ménage* does not appear. The children spent much of their time travelling between England and Switzerland; one of their first jobs on reaching a new hotel was to search for treasures inside red velvet chairs, until put off by finding a set of false teeth. At the hymn at her first church service Katherine joyfully contributed the only song she knew, "Girls and boys, come out to play".

Psychologists may ponder for a long time the bringing up of the children in this abode of invalids. Symonds's interests in art and literature were combined with research into homosexuality and with opinions far from conventional. His daughter says he is best represented by the prayer of Cleanthes, adapted for his own use:

Lead Thou me, God, law, reason, motion, life,
All names for Thee alike are vain and hollow.
Lead Thou me, and I will follow without strife,
For, if I strive, still must I blindly follow.

The mother's main interest was flowers (here many pages could have been saved), and when she said, "I like flowers ever so much better than people", Katherine, aged 5, replied, "And I like flowers ever so much, and people too". That answer probably reveals the secret of Dame Katherine's success in life, especially in the difficult pioneer work of organizing women for national service. From the account of that work I can take but one story, that of Queen Alexandra visiting the V.A.D. office and remarking to a typist, "A sewing machine, I see. How useful", and the typist standing up and dutifully saying, "Yes, Ma'am".

In 1909 Mrs. Furse visited Newfoundland with the Northcliffes; she wrote to her sister, Mrs. Vaughan, words which have their message today as then:

> If only Will could see a little more of the Empire, he would be a better educator of boys. If our schoolmasters could realize the awful trouble ahead of England if she is to hold her own in the world's race —if they could teach their boys the most important things for the future instead of going on in the routine of the past, and above all if they could hear the opinions of hardworking good men in Canada and hear of our public school boy and the difficulty of using him. You talk of Westminster, and I think you would hear all the Canadians and certainly Newfoundlanders talk with equal reverence and love of it. But when you think of the fight now going on at Westminster, the petty home topics discussed with so much vehemence, and then you see the vast spaces over here fast crowding with men who want the great Empire topics discussed instead, you see the need for an Empire Parliament rather than the Parliament we have or in addition to it.

My engagements ended, I was conveyed to my next abiding-place, there to find that excellent combination, all the freedom I needed together with the warmth and comfort of a home whose interests were the church and the children, books and music. Here I read, in ease I felt to have earned, a volume most suitable for bed—Mrs. M. Vivian Hughes's *A London Family between the Wars* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.). Those who have read Mrs. Hughes's previous volumes will welcome this one, which describes life at Cuffley "where the Zeppelin came down", and the transformation of Cuffley during twenty years. Mrs. Hughes writes, with the light and intimate touch which many have come to know, of the new house and garden, her boys and her neighbours, her examining and her lectures, her jaunts afield and her old friends; she has given us a pleasant book which should prove a resting-place to scores of tired people in hours when they want to escape the strain of perilous days.

By the time Newcastle had been reached for a quick lunch with a friend and a Mid-day Service, the back of Mr. Herbert Read's *Annals of Innocence and Experience* (Faber, 10s. 6d.), which incorporates *The Innocent Eye*, had already been broken, and the problem of why Mr. Read was so much harder to read than Mrs. Hughes had been solved. It is not, I think, because Mrs. Hughes writes about things and Mr. Read about thoughts, nor that her language is that of everyday life and his technical; it is rather that he is self-conscious, and that much of the book smells of the lamp: when he wishes to speak of the influence of Blake's poems upon him, he says, "they pierced me like gleaming steel, and their meaning was annealed to my mind". Yet Mr. Read can write terse and vigorous prose; during the

long ride from Newcastle to London I grudged leaving it—and an empty carriage, for nobody wants to arrive in London at 10 p.m. nowadays—even for the dining car. The other day I heard someone say of an autobiography that it was so pedestrian that not a phrase remained in the mind. Mr. Read's picture of his youth, of his life in the Army and subsequently, is not in the least like that; to his discussion of the relation of art and happiness and of the influence of Browning on modern poetry I shall often turn, while sentences like these speak today with awful poignancy:

> The terrible fragility of life was made evident to me. I saw that individuality and intelligence and all the unique make of a man could seep into the ground with a trickle of warm blood.

Of course, I was often roused to protest; I do not believe that "the fear of death compels men to a religious faith", nor do I think the novels of Flaubert and Henry James among the highest achievements of humanity. But much of Mr. Read's literary and art criticism is to me *terra incognita*, and many times I fail to get his meaning. This is true even of his prose on occasion. I suppose I should be intelligent enough to know precisely what is meant by "Life, even in its intimate or arcane recesses, is still dialectical", but I don't. The prefatory poem I passed across the lunch-table to my friend, who after an interval remarked, "Well, I've read it up and I've read it down, and can make nothing of it".

To Mr. Read I am drawn as a Yorkshireman, and I think of him taking down the volumes of Nietzche one by one in the Leeds University Library as I had done five years before him. I do not agree, however, that my friend and teacher, F. W. Moorman, was the most inspiring of the teachers in the University; to speak only of those no longer alive (to one of the living Mr. Read gives a wrong initial), Moorman's chief, C. E. Vaughan, was a far more virile personality, with a range of knowledge Moorman would never have claimed for himself.

Mr. Read is philosopher as well as poet and critic, and many will note with interest the debt he acknowledges to Kierkegaard, who in these days is striding into his own in seven-leagued boots. Altogether Mr. Read's work may be recommended to those who desire to exercise their brains. By the time its last page was turned I was tired, and therefore looked for the lightest book in the bag. It was Mr. John R. Allan's *England without End* (Methuen, 8s. 6d.). Mr. Allan, being a Scot, does not know the difference between "shall" and "will" or "should" and "would", but he has a pleasant pawky humour. A "gotten", with its suggestion of America, was startling, for there is no other sign of American domicile. The best thing about the book is its social passion. Mr. Allan, who obviously knows something about farming, is disturbed, even incensed, by the folly and selfishness of our social system. I cannot but think, however, that a work directly concerned with economic questions would have been more effective than this muddled account of visits to England. Mr. Allan ought to realize at his time of life that accounts of youthful sprees, and of the many occasions when he was more or less drunk, are of interest to nobody but himself.

I had estimated in my folly that I could finish with the wandering Scot by the time London was reached, but Adolf then took a hand. Suddenly the train was plunged into darkness and began to crawl, so that reading was impossible, and all that could be done was to think and watch and pray. It was an eerie business riding in darkness through the night, with occasional mysterious rattlings on the roof. Shortly after midnight we steamed slowly into King's Cross, to find that the "All Clear" had just sounded and the streets were safe. No taxi was discernible, but a lorry driver was accommodating, and by one o'clock I was in bed at my hotel.

The first task next morning was to ascertain whether trains to Bournemouth were running to time after Southampton's visitations. Reassured, I started out, ending *England Without End* on the way. East Cliff had given up hope of my arrival, and Dr. John Short, who will soon have the right to be tired of substituting for delayed London preachers, was ready to mount the pulpit stairs when I arrived. He and I shared with the Rev. E. W. Coltman and his people in a very happy 63rd Anniversary.

Before I slept I had read Mr. W. Forbes Gray's Introduction to John Buchan's *Comments and Characters* (Nelson, 7s. 6d.), articles contributed to the *Scottish Review* in 1907 and 1908. In some ways this Introduction is the most valuable part of the volume, for it prints a good deal of information about Buchan's attempt to make the journal, whose readers were largely churchgoers, into a penny *Spectator*, and of his failure to understand popular appeal. Almost certainly he would have turned down the proposal to reprint many of these articles, some of which deal with forgotten episodes in political history, while others are obviously written merely to fill a column. It may be, of course, that next day I was in no mood to judge fairly, for ere I opened the book again I had spent some hours in Southampton. When one had stood in the ruins of the church which enshrined the memory of Isaac Watts (his bust still stood on high surveying the desolation wrought by man) or talked to people who had lost home *and* church *and* business, perhaps it was scarcely to be expected that pages on "Haldane's 'New Model' Army" or "Votes for Women" would be found entrancing. The later papers are a different story—those on literary and historical subjects, on travel and climbing, and on famous Scotsmen—Rosebery, Balfour, Campbell-Bannerman, Haldane, Kelvin, Livingstone, Barrie, Edward Caird, and Archbishop Lang. In view of the position the writer subsequently filled so adequately in Canada, the articles on the Empire also have their interest. My greatest disappointment in Canada recently was that Buchan was not alive to give me the audience he had promised: there was an old controversy about Cromwell that I had hoped to continue, and also a discussion began at a little dining club when Buchan, the Bishop of Gloucester, and Dr. James Reid were the guests. It was fine to learn from the Acting Governor-General and others what an impression Buchan's character and personality had made on the Canadian people. Something of his gifts and charm can be seen in these papers of thirty years ago; perhaps the most typical of them is the review of Saintsbury; that on Meredith reads strangely today, and I wish it had been possible to ask Lord Tweedsmuir in 1940 whether he agreed with John Buchan in 1908 that the permanence of Meredith's influence "seems as assured as any in our literature".

The week-end had stretched out to Thursday; by the time home was reached all the books in the bag but one had been read, and despite the booming of barrage I took myself wearily to bed.

ALBERT PEEL.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

If St. Paul had founded a college near Corinth, he would not have been content to include a course of apologetics in his curriculum. He would have sent his boys into the streets of Corinth. But in those days Christianity had the crusading spirit that Communism has captured today. Christ did not say: "Now, remember that though I should like you tactfully to insinuate in the minds of your friends a hint that there is a lot to be said for loving one's neighbour, I do not want you to ram your religion down other people's throats". What Christ said was: "Go into the world and preach the Gospel to every creature". The Apostles were so controversial that many of them died violent deaths. For the Church militant is always unpopular. It is only a Church dormant which can hope for toleration.

Arnold Lunn, *Come What May.*

The sins of individual man today, which Christianity realizes as sins, important and grievous though they are, count for little in his burden of destiny compared with the corporate sins for which the responsibility can be imputed neither to individuals nor to governments. If these sins cannot be recognized and condemned by Christianity, is it any wonder that Christianity is so widely felt to have no purchase on the contemporary world? For it is in consequence of these sins that mankind is being driven down the steep road to destruction and death.

Thus it is that Christianity has come to occupy the merest corner in the mind of contemporary society. It is the affair of professionals whose real occupation is to try to make people feel good, when the realities of the situation demand that they should feel bad. Since the number is steadily increasing of those who are so exposed to the strains and stresses of a disintegrating society that they cannot be made to feel good, the potency of the Church's ministrations is steadily diminishing. . . And even among those who are still faithful, Christianity comes to occupy a smaller and smaller place in the individual mind. Where could we look today, for instance, to find a statesman whose mind is so saturated in Christianity as was that of W. E. Gladstone?

J. Middleton Murry, *The Betrayal of Christ by the Churches.*

We naturally attach a special value to Holy Communion, but not a mechanical or automatic value. Nor is it satisfactory to base our valuation of it on a literalistic interpretation of a sentence in *1 Cor.* 11. The words "Do this in remembrance of Me, . . . Do this as often as ye drink it in remembrance of Me", are not certainly found in any of the Gospels, but only in *1 Cor.;* and exact scholarship has to take seriously the possibility that the Christian Community may here be speaking in the name of their Lord. To make this the foundation of our religious life would be like trying to balance a pyramid upon its apex—and on an unsteady point of support. For stable equilibrium we want a broader and firmer foundation. In any case we must beware of a stiff literalism which would not be at all in accordance with the greatness of Christ revealed in the Gospels. It is His free Spirit we need, not to be "unduly fettered to the letter of His reported words". The spiritual cannot be reduced to a formula.

J. W. Hunkin, *The Spirit of Man and the Spirit of God.*

FOREIGN REVIEWS.

Spiritual Revolution in the East. By WALTER FREYTAG, Ph.D. Translated by L. M. Stalker. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

This book is based on "observations made during an extensive journey" through the Dutch East Indies, in New Guinea "through all the western part of the former German colony of Kaiser-Wilhelmsland, now under Australian mandate", in China, especially in the Kwantung Province, and in British India. Dr. Freytag writes with the vividness of one who sees new countries with fresh eyes, and has much of interest and value to say about the manifestations of the Gospel's power in the lives of those whose circumstances differ much from ours. He does not, indeed, escape the dangers of inaccuracy due to imperfect knowledge which beset the traveller. Thus in his short and somewhat superficial account of India he speaks of Travancore as "a district in which only one language is spoken", not knowing that in the extreme South Tamil is actually more used than Malayalam, the State language. Again, he speaks of the "50 million Pariahs" of India, in evident ignorance that the Pariahs are only one of the many low castes which make up the so-called "Depressed Classes". Such errors in regard to a field we know affect our confidence in the accuracy of his description of the countries of which we have no personal knowledge.

Dr. Freytag's journey was financed not only by German Missionary Societies but by the Organization of German Science and the Hamburg Scientific Institute. He does not mention the date of his journey. If, as seems probable, it was made after the Nazis came into power, it must be assumed that it was undertaken with the approval of the Nazi Government.

In the first section of the book, that dealing with "the old German colony of Kaiser-Wilhelmsland" in New Guinea, now under the mandate of Australia, Dr. Freytag remarks that the present "Government knows that the natives are not likely to distinguish between German missionaries and Germany". If the German missionaries there share Dr. Freytag's views, it is not surprising that Papuans fail to make this distinction. He laments the good old days of German rule. Then the German missionaries, acting apparently with the support of their Government, recognized the tribal unity; "overseers were chosen—by vocation, not vote, men who had the requisite gifts of leadership". Thieves could be flogged, and "disciplinary action might be taken by one village on another . . . If, for instance, a village allowed a case of adultery to go unpunished, its fields might all be destroyed". Now

> any native may complain to the *kiap* if he is punished. Flogging is prohibited; even parents are forbidden to chastise their children. If the people did not continue to exercise discipline in spite of the government it would mean that the native community would be deprived of the possibility of self-preservation.

Dr. Freytag has not a word to say in praise of the present government. Yet his condemnation of the changes made by the Australian government will seem to many British and American readers to be a condemnation of which that government may well be proud.

The final chapters deal with "Civilization, Nations in the Making, and the Question of Religion", and with "Immature Christianity in the Meeting between East and West". He makes the usual German complaint against "Anglo-Saxon" Christianity:

The history of the Anglo-Saxon race makes it comprehensible that to them the ideal of democracy seems to accrue fairly directly out of the Gospel, and they are inclined to re-coin Jesus' call to the individual to repent into the theory of the sanctity of personality. They understand the proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom as a call to a great campaign against the social evils of humanity, and think that with goodwill it can be accomplished. Perhaps the practical earnestness of personal Christianity in Anglo-Saxon countries is not nearly so strongly affected by such perversions of Biblical fact as we in Germany imagine. In the Eastern world they mean nothing less than a presumption of the divine justification of the destructive tendencies of civilization, or at least of the dissolution of social forms and their sustaining power. They represent the encouragement of the unstable marriage for love, the undermining of authority, the justification of the severance of the individual from tribe and family.

More harmless are certain favourite ideas, which are so strongly upheld in the name of the Christian message that they are sometimes made a condition of baptism. Such, for instance, is the exaggerated emphasis laid on abstention from alcohol or nicotine. Fashionable opinions of the moment, too, such as co-education, sometimes play an unseemly and pernicious rôle.

The history of missions has provided some justification for this complaint. From whatever country missionaries come, there is, as Dr. Freytag points out, the danger that

> the message may be distorted into becoming the herald of Western civilization, or at least it remains encumbered with relics of the contact between Western ideas and the Gospel, which are alien to the East.

In time of war it is good to be reminded of the devoted service German missionaries have given to the proclamation of the Gospel in pagan lands, and the reviewer would have preferred, had it been possible, to speak only in praise of a book on the present missionary situation written by one who is the Director of the German Evangelical Missions Fund and the Editor of the new *Evangelische Missions-Zeitschrift* which has taken the place of many missionary magazines of pre-Nazi Germany. The defects of this book are only too obvious to English eyes. Yet, as Dr. William Paton says in his judicious Foreword,

> it would be a lamentable thing if such defects, the more annoying to English readers because of the psychological situation in which war sets us all, were to obscure the value of the book.
>
> Few, if any, who read this English edition will not feel that humanly speaking the continuance of much of the missionary enterprise is bound up with the disappearance of Nazi authority from the world. But that must not blind us to the other truth, that in the fellowship of the world-wide Christian mission and the universal Church it is possible for a unity to persist in spite of war. Nothing can be more certain than that the different types of insight and ability which the Americans, the Germans and the British apply to the task of world missions all need one another.

This book, as reflecting the attitude to missionary problems of an influential leader of German Protestant missions, deserves the attention of those who frame the missionary policies of our Churches. Dr. Freytag seems quite unaware that he has anything to learn from the far wider experience of American and British Missionary Societies, but that is not a reason why we should not seek to learn from him.

SYDNEY CAVE.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.
"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.
(The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.)

The Development of Religious Toleration in England. Attainment of the Theory and Accommodations in Thought and Institutions (1640-1660). By W. K. JORDAN, Ph.D. Allen & Unwin. 21s.

Before long we must take more extended space for an estimation of Dr. W. K. Jordan's achievement, now brought to a triumphant conclusion in its fourth volume, which deals with the years of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. They are years which include Cromwell and Milton, the Cambridge Platonists, Prynne and Hobbes, and Thorndike and Austin. On all these Dr. Jordan draws, but characteristically he has a section devoted to "The Rank and File: The Inarticulate". Without doubt, however, all who have followed Dr. Jordan through the previous volumes will turn first to the twenty pages in which the author marshals his conclusions. Examination of those conclusions and of the mass of evidence leading up to them must wait for the present, but we can imagine no better essay subject for a candidate for a History Honours Degree than a discussion of these words:

> The conviction had gained strength in English thought that the ends of national life in the modern world could not be attained until the divisive and destructive energies of religious conflict had been tamed by toleration. This opinion was very generally entertained in the England of 1660.

In view of what happened in 1662 theological students might well be asked to consider this statement. Dr. Jordan, of course, has his answers ready as he develops his argument, and when students have thought for themselves they should turn to see what he has to say.

Over a long period Dr. Jordan has given his days and nights to research into this vital subject, and he has left all scholars in his debt: their gratitude will find expression in constant use of the four volumes for many years to come.

EDITOR.

Simeon and Church Order. By CHARLES SMYTH. Cambridge Press. 16s.

Last quarter we noticed that R. M. Beverley was severely criticized in Mr. D. A. Winstanley's *Early Victorian Cambridge*. He reappears—now "the odious Mr. Beverley"—in Canon Charles Smyth's Birkbeck Lectures, *Simeon and Church Order* (Cambridge Press, 16s.). The sub-title, "A Study of the Origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the 18th Century", indicates the scope of the lectures much better than the title, but Canon Smyth does not seem to have any definite aim: we have almost as much about Smyth as about Simeon, who pops up now and then in interesting pages, some of which cover the same ground as Mr. Winstanley's book. Even in his personal sections, however, Canon Smyth is readable—when denouncing the tyranny of archives or proclaiming that an essential qualification for the ecclesiastical historian is that he should have been a parish priest. Perhaps the most valuable sections are those dealing with Berridge

of Everton and Cadogan of Reading: Berridge's determination to be "neck or nothing" in his evangelism was but a step beyond Wesley's "Church or no Church, we must attend to the saving of souls".

Although Canon Smyth has been—so he tells us—a parish priest, he is far from reaching that objectivity which should mark the historian. "Of prophesyings", he says, "the Church of England had always been advisedly suspicious", though an Archbishop of Canterbury believed so much in them that his royal mistress suspended him. We do not mind such references as that to the "negative weariness of Presbyterian and Independent preachings", but such cheap gibes as "not until 1871 was the University finally made safe for nonconformity, latitudinarianism, and infidelity", might have been resisted by one qualifying to be an historian. Toward the end of the book all pretence at being objective is thrown overboard. Because they attended the services of the Church of Scotland (1848) the Royal Family are "careless of ecclesiastical propriety"; the Prince Consort has "odd Lutheran prejudices"; and when Norman Macleod complains of Archbishop Longley's "admittedly indiscreet" conduct in Scotland, he goes "whimpering to Windsor Castle". But at last all is well: that firm "Defender of the Faith", Edward VII, comes to the rescue of "Church Order", and Queen Victoria's practice of regular communion at Crathie Church was "firmly discontinued".

It is no pleasure to point out these deviations from the strict and narrow path which should mark the historian, but Canon Smyth, in this and previous books, has given so much evidence of his ability to search, and write, and think, that he should be warned lest he stray so far from the path that it will be impossible for him to regain it.

EDITOR.

The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus. By GEORGE OGG. Cambridge Press. 15s.

The Kingdom of God. By C. A. ALINGTON, D.D. Centenary Press. 3s. 6d.

The Gospel of the Kingdom. By FREDERICK C. GRANT. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

St. Paul and his Gospel. By A. E. BAKER. Eyre & Spottiswoode. 5s.

The Primitive Christian Catechism. By PHILIP CARRINGTON. Cambridge Press. 7s. 6d.

These five books fall under the common title of New Testament Studies. The first is the product of a Scottish manse to which, as to English parsonages, we owe so much, not only as examples of pastoral devotion but as the sources of sound scholarship. It is a D.Litt (St. Andrews) thesis and well deserves its laurel. "Chronology" (Dr. Ogg quotes Thomas Fuller) "is a surly, churlish, cur and hath bit many a man's fingers." This is specially true of the Gospel and early Christian chronology—the author's bibliography contains some 112 items. It must suffice to say that Dr. Ogg has tamed his cur, though we may not all agree with him as to its breed. The book is well planned and well documented, and the argument marches steadily to the conclusion that the baptism of Jesus occurred in A.D. 29, that the first passover of the public ministry was that of A.D. 30, that the Galilean ministry did not begin till after Tabernacles A.D. 31 and lasted about a year, and that the date of the crucifixion is A.D. 33. This presupposes two long spells of ministry in Jerusalem and a general dependence on the Fourth Gospel which, in view of its symbolic tendencies, I find it

hard to share. Dr. Ogg will have nothing to do with the dislocation theory, and in the handling of the nameless feast of *John* 5^{1} he seems to be unacquainted with Dr. Rendel Harris's suggestion in *Side Lights on New Testament Research*. No doubt the quest will continue; meanwhile Dr. Ogg's erudite study holds the field and serves not only as a "mine of information" but as an example of good craftsmanship.

The Dean of Durham adorns all that he writes (how delightful were the fables of his Shrewsbury days!), and here he presents a convincing plea for what is commonly known as "realized eschatology". If it is true that "Jesus was a Pelagian and Paul an Augustinian", the Dean is on the side of Jesus in seeing the good in man and treating sin as sickness. In the darkness of the present time he insists that the light is shining and is not mastered. By realizing that the Kingdom is with us now and by acting on that realization, we shall best prepare the way for its ultimate and final manifestation. This little book is full of good things persuasively expressed: it will enrich and encourage every reader. On p. 49 the reference to *Isaiah* 12^{7} should be corrected to 52^{7}.

Nor will the Haskell Lectures delivered by Professor Grant of Union Seminary, New York, please the apocalyptists, or the "on to orthodoxy" school, or for that matter those who see in Jesus the social reformer or the ethical philosopher. There is a good deal of repetition in this book, no doubt because of its spoken form, but the gist of it is that Jesus as a prophet and teacher lived in such fellowship with God that His convictions were expressed with divine authority. His teaching was purely and simply religious. It is an eminently readable book, taking account of the soundest current contributions to the study of the life and teaching of Jesus, to which it is itself an admirable introduction. The wood and the trees are both in proper perspective. There is a misprint on p. 82 (l. 5 from the bottom).

I am sure that Canon Baker himself would not endorse the claim of the jacket that his is a "brilliant" exposition of the personality, experience, and teaching of Paul. I am not sure for whom it is specially intended; but it is a serviceable general introduction to the theme. There are points in it which attract me, *e.g.*, the influence of the Tarsus environment on the adolescent young Pharisee, and the counsel that we should read "Messiah" instead of "Christ" where the latter term has not become a personal name. There are other points which repel, *e.g.*, the identification of the Church with the Kingdom, and the insistence on sacraments as essential to faith. So we may say that the book is mildly stimulating. It is based on the Pauline epistles, and chapter and verse are given for almost every statement.

In his chapter on "The Tradition behind the Gospels" Prof. Grant remarks that "the consequence of this new approach (form-criticism) is that we are forced to arrange our materials in genetic relationship as far as possible, but without trying to knit up everything in one close-meshed scheme of religious thought". An application of this method to the epistles has been successfully essayed by the Bishop of Quebec, whose work reminds us in some ways of Prof. Hunter's recent book, *Paul and his Predecessors*. The point selected for treatment is the *catechesis* or instruction (preparatory to baptism) of Gentile converts in the primitive church. The author's endeavour is to show that the procedure is largely an inheritance from and a continuance (under new conditions) of Jewish practice. On the basis of a series of formulæ occurring in *Col.*, *Eph.*, *1 Pet.*, and *James* he envisages a pattern on the following lines. I. Neo-levitical and rabbinic precepts; II. The Word—as salvation, new birth, seed; III. The Baptismal Paraenesis—put off evil, submit yourselves, watch and pray, resist the devil. The book

is the work of a scholar, and not the least of its merits is that it points the way to further studies in the field of Christian origins.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

Handbook to the Cambridgeshire Syllabus of Religious Teaching. By BASIL A. YEAXLEE, Ph.D. S.C.M. 4s. 6d.

> The great improvement in the quality of Syllabuses of Religious Instruction since the first issue of the Cambridge Agreed Syllabus in 1924 has relieved teachers of many difficulties but has confronted them with others. . . . The teacher feels the need of books which deal with the actual shaping and content of the lessons he desires to give.

To meet this need the S.P.C.K. a year or more ago issued a *Handbook of Christian Teaching* for use with agreed syllabuses generally. It was blessed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and his opposite number Dr. Scott Lidgett, and was the work of a strong editorial committee of Anglican and Free churchmen, with Dr. Yeaxlee as principal editor.

Under the auspices of the Institute of Christian Education (instigated in turn by the Cambridgeshire Education Committee) Dr. Yeaxlee has now written his second volume, similar in some respects to its predecessor but with a more restricted aim. It is meant specifically for teachers who use the Cambridge Syllabus, and still more specifically for the senior section, *i.e.*, the group quaintly known as 11+ to 15+. It is, like its predecessor, a very competent production; the writer of it is a master, both as regards what to teach and how to teach it, and well fulfils his purpose of supplying background material.

With Professor Manson's recent *Companion to the Bible* we have a trilogy of biblical knowledge and wisdom that will stand not only the teacher but the preacher (who ought always to be a teacher) in good stead.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

Scholasticism and Politics. By JACQUES MARITAIN. Centenary Press. 10s. 6d.

M. Maritain looks out upon the turmoil and chaos of the modern world from what he feels to be the secure basis of the Thomist philosophy. Indeed, it is not surprising that a Thomist should have this feeling, since in the midst of our modern uncertainties and perplexities Thomism stands out as a system complete and entire with "a place for everything and everything in its place". To have a firm and solid structure beneath one, wide enough and large enough to make possible every kind of orientation, gives a sense of strength and even of superiority in dealing with the waywardness of modern political and social theories.

The central principle of Thomism is the doctrine of the two kingdoms. The lower kingdom is the kingdom of nature, in which man, guided by reason, strives towards the common good. To this kingdom belong the virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance. The higher kingdom is the kingdom of grace. To it belong the virtues of faith, hope and charity. It is in the subordination of the kingdom of nature to the kingdom of grace that St. Thomas finds the link which binds the whole universe together. But this subordination is no destruction of nature, but is rather the way of its fulfilment. The characteristic maxim of the Thomist philosophy which explains its whole structure and meaning is:—"Grace does not overthrow nature, but rather perfects it".

It is from this fundamental Thomist position that M. Maritain criticizes the various trends of modern politics. The bourgeois individualism and rationalism of Rousseau, the Communism of Marx and Lenin, the Fascism of

Mussolini and the National-Socialism of Hitler are all tried and found wanting. Rousseau's dream of an individual free to express himself according to his pleasure ended in the weak going to the wall and in the reign of plutocracy over its wage-slaves. The other forms of social and political theory just mentioned have followed upon bourgeois individualism as its Nemesis, but they have not escaped its materialistic bias. The trouble with all is that they are anthropocentric. They set up man and especially economic man as the end of existence instead of God. Or if they do deify anything, it is either the State or the demonic forces of race and blood. M. Maritain would call the world back to St. Thomas and his subordination of nature to grace. The secret of true political theory is an openness towards God which keeps alive the higher values of civilization and prevents the deadly miasma of materialism from destroying the image of God in man. This secret M. Maritain seeks to express in the slogan of a "democracy of personality". This is his modernization of the Thomist doctrine of nature and grace.

We are carefully to distinguish between the individual and the person. The principle of individuality is matter, which in this case means the human body with its physical basis and its animal instincts. Each body is informed by a soul which organizes it into a unity. But at the level of individualism this organization goes no further than the gathering of the bodily and mental forces for the satisfaction of physical and animal needs and urgencies. Moreover, since matter always tends to decompose, the process is apt to break up again into a multiplicity of uncontrolled and uncontrollable instincts: the unity of the mere individual is always precarious.

Very different is the unity produced by the principle of personality. M. Maritain understands by personality that side of man on which he is open to God and to the higher values which emanate from Him and represent Him in the world. Here we have man universal as opposed to man individual and particular. Here is the true principle, not only of the unity of human nature in itself, but also of the union of men with one another through justice and love, or at least through the friendship which is the analogue of supernatural charity upon the plane of nature.

But there is one thing more. The person and the individual, though logically distinguishable, are the same being. Certainly, the individual must not attempt to oust the person—the result is materialism and the social misery of modern times. But equally the person cannot oust the individual. The person cannot be formed in man, unless his material needs are satisfied.

Such is the central argument of M. Maritain's book, which is discursive and touches on many other subjects, more or less closely related to the principal theme. There are chapters entitled Science and Philosophy, Democracy and Authority, The Thomist Idea of Freedom, Freudianism and Psycho-analysis, Action and Contemplation, Catholic Action and Political Action, Christianity and Earthly Civilization. But the core of the book is in the chapters: Integral Humanism and the Crisis of Modern Times, The Human Person and Society; and it is these chapters which have been summarized above.

M. Maritain is just another voice saying that mankind must become substantially Christian or perish. The Thomist ethic, while it incorporates the Platonic virtues, imbues them with a Christian spirit. M. Maritain, in order still further to bring out the Christian character of Thomism, avails himself of the Kantian doctrine of the person, into which as a mould he pours the content of the Thomist doctrine. In the end, after all, it is not so much Thomism as a philosophy but the essential Christianity embodied in Thomism which M. Maritain uses all the powers of his reflection and his eloquence

to recommend to our time. It is the combination of wide knowledge and analytic power with deep Christian feeling that gives value to *Scholasticism and Politics.* ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Analysis of Knowledge. By LEDGER WOOD. Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d.

Professor Ledger Wood, of Princeton University, has written a most careful and detailed study of the difficult subject of knowledge. We all know and we know that we know; but how do we know that we know? That is the epistemological question, to the tackling of which Prof. Wood braces himself.

His method is to analyse knowledge. It has many forms: there is perceptual knowledge of "things", and there is knowledge through memory founded on perception. There is introspective knowledge of ourselves, and somehow also there is knowledge of other selves. Then beyond these more immediate forms of knowledge there is conceptual knowledge, which at its highest points becomes categorial knowledge. These last two forms of knowledge develop the work begun by perception, memory, and introspection. But there are yet other and different forms of knowledge, *viz.*, formal knowledge, the kind of knowledge involved in logic, and finally valuational knowledge, as exemplified in ethical and æsthetic valuation. This appears to be a list of very diverse matters—yet we group all these different things under the common head of knowledge. How is it that we do so? The reply given to this most important question is that, diverse as are the forms of knowledge mentioned, they all possess a reference to something beyond themselves: this reference Prof. Wood describes by the name of *intentionality.*

Knowledge intends or refers to an object: this is its characteristic feature, and all the fundamental issues of epistemology centre round about this fact. But how do we test the reference of knowledge beyond itself? That is the next question to which we come, and the answer given to it by Prof. Wood determines the line of his whole investigation. He maintains that all true knowledge is founded upon perception and introspection of the processes connected therewith. But what guarantees the truth of perception? Though perception largely depends upon memory and imagination, it is the sensory elements that can be analysed out of it which are the foundation of its certainty. While rejecting the theory of "atomic" *sensa,* Prof. Wood regards sensation as an ultimate: we know the characters of our sensations by "inspection", and beyond that we cannot go. When we add to this inspection of sensations the intentional reference to the object for which they stand we are at the beginning of knowledge.

Knowledge proper, however, is knowledge contained in propositions. Truth is only implicit in perception, memory, and introspection: it becomes explicit in propositions, the mark of which is that they involve concepts. With the concept we reach a new stage of the epistemological problem. What is a concept, and how do we know by means of concepts? The object of the concept is a class of particular things connected by some resemblance: this object has always a hypothetical character, as it goes beyond empirical evidence while it is yet of use in enabling us to master experience. The categories are simply the highest concepts and their character is not essentially different from that of other concepts. Ethical values stand in the same relation to action as concepts and categories do to perception.

We are now in a position to see how Prof. Wood thinks of knowledge as a whole. Knowledge always aims at the systematization of experience; but

owing to the hypothetical character of its higher forms, many systems are possible. The validity of conceptual and categorial knowledge, and even of formal knowledge, is always postulational. There may be varieties of logic, as there are varieties of geometry. The test of all such forms of knowledge is in the final reference to perception, including memory and introspection.

It is clear that in the end Prof. Wood's theory of knowledge is pragmatic. The affinities are with Locke in the first place for the foundations, and then with William James for the further development. The theory is presented as a *via media* between idealism and empiricism, but it stands much nearer to empiricism than to idealism. Accordingly, *The Analysis of Knowledge* is very sharply contrasted, both in method and tendency, with Prof. Brand Blanshard's recent book, *The Nature of Thought,* lately reviewed in these columns. Both books are excellent of their kind; and there could hardly be a better introduction to modern epistemology than to read the one against the other. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Social Function of Religion. By E. O. JAMES, D.Litt., Ph.D., F.S.A. University of London Press. 7s. 6d.

Dr. James describes this volume—in the London Theological Library, edited by Prof. Eric S. Waterhouse—as a preliminary statement, believing that the time is ripe for a re-consideration of the social function of religion. In his effort to regulate his relationships man has arrived at certain fundamental evaluations which have consolidated the social structure and supplied its dynamic. But these forces have been weakened by false conceptions of progress and by a materialistic humanism or a worship of quasi-divine leaders. What is needful is a re-discovery of the truth that society must be constituted on a religious basis. But the discovery of a method requires the study of the long and complex history which has preceded our present problems. They cannot be understood without reference to their context in the past. Dr. James has therefore reviewed historically the religious conceptions which have determined social relationships, under the heading of the dominating conception of an over-riding and beneficent Providence, or as exemplified in myth and revelation, ritual and worship, and in the resulting ethic and conduct which the religious conception sustains and enforces. He also discusses, upon the same lines, the relationship of the Church to the Community, and the new Nationalisms. The chapters dealing with each subject are full of instruction and are all followed by a useful bibliography. The book is ultimately an attempt to interpret the integrating function of religion in terms of the eternal Christian verities. It is the affirmation of an ethical Providence, of immortality, and of the transcendental value of human life, which alone can bring man out of barbarism to the establishment of a kingdom which is at once of the earth and heavenly. But Dr. James concludes with the reminder that Christianity is a "way of life", not a theological system, and that these are days which require of every man adventurous service, to make ready for the inbreaking into human history of God Incarnate. H. B. SHEPHEARD.

Supreme Encounter. The God of History in the World of To-day. By BASIL MATHEWS. S.C.M. 6s.

Mr. Basil Mathews, who has travelled so widely and enjoyed the friendship of the leaders of the Christian community of every race, finds that their problems to-day are concerned with the same conflict between good and evil which has faced Israel and the Christian Church in every age. It is

a recurring crisis, and the present world-upheaval is reflected and foretold in many dramatic scenes recorded in the Bible from *Genesis* to the Apocalypse —God in history breaking in upon the human stage. Mr. Mathews retells some of these occasions with the descriptive power and scholarship which we have learned to expect of him (He expresses his obligation to Dr. Wheeler Robinson and Dr. C. H. Dodd). He tells of Elijah and Jezebel, Amos and the abuse of wealth and privilege, of Isaiah and Jeremiah and Ezekiel prophesying against the sins and idols of their day, of John the Baptist and of our Lord's final challenge and defeat of evil upon the Cross. But the conflict continues to this day, through the apostles and martyrs and in the Church in the world, until the apocalyptic Armageddon shall bring it to an end. Mr. Mathews's book is valuable in its testimony to the reality of evil—no shadow which throws the light into relief, as some, perhaps too easily, believed not so long ago. If his contention needed further proof experience has surely supplied it to us now. The book is very readable, and will be useful to many, ministerial and lay.

H. B. Shepheard.

The Realm of Spirit. By George Santayana. Constable. 16s.

Mr. Santayana has been engaged for the last sixteen years in working out a system of philosophy. He calls it by the general title of "Realms of Being", and it includes the Realms of Essence, of Matter, of Truth, and now in a fourth volume the Realm of Spirit. Mr. Santayana has been called a critical realist. His philosophy is mainly ontological, but it is also scientific, and, as he says, "a discipline of the mind and heart, a lay religion". He is a poet and an artist as well as a philosopher, but takes the whole world of human actions and interests for his subject. and he writes of it all in a nervous and flexible prose that makes the reading of him a delight.

By Spirit he does not mean to suggest the kind of thing in which the Psychical Research Society deals. What he calls Spirit "is only that inner light of actuality or attention which floods all life as men actually live it on earth. It is roughly the same thing as feeling or thought", though it is apparently bigger than either. It might fairly be described as that which makes personality. Mr. Santayana discusses the nature of Spirit both in the abstract and in its various animistic manifestations, and then goes on to describe its relations with the will, freedom, intuition, and the like. The goal of it all is union; union, that is to say, with the absolute or God, or, as Mr. Santayana prefers to put it, with the Good. As he says again, "the good is not merely a harmony to be established or approached in the economy of nature; it is an influence to be felt, an inner transformation to be experienced, a beatific vision and union with God". As these words indicate, there is a deeply religious note about all Mr. Santayana's writing, and his book on the Spirit is a useful antidote to the humanistic tendency of some of his earlier works.

W. B. Selbie.

Science and Geeta. By T. N. Roy. From the author, Calcutta.

This little book contains the author's translation of the *Gita* together with very useful explanatory notes, a "General Introduction" dealing with the present relation of Science and Religion, and an "Ideological Introduction" explaining the specific teachings of the *Gita*, and a "Conclusion" in which the writer seeks to show the way by which the soul may win liberation. We have read this book with much interest, for it reveals how a gifted and widely read Hindu interprets this most significant of the Sacred Books of India. The book is inscribed to the Reader:

> May He who has prompted the writing of this book grant you the leisure, the inclination and the patience to read it carefully and enable you to obtain peace, tranquillity and happiness even in this world of strife, sickness and death.

The book well illustrates the place which the *Gita* holds in the lives of many educated Hindus to-day, and thus merits the sympathetic study of those to whom not the *Gita* but the New Testament has brought the secret of peace, and a message, not of self-liberation, but of God's redeeming act in Christ.

SYDNEY CAVE.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading).*

To the many excellent books on the Bible it has published, the Oxford Press has now added *Ancient and English Versions of the Bible* (12s. 6d.). The name of the Editor, Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, who himself writes the sections on "The Hebrew Bible" and "The Bible as the Word of God", is itself a guarantee of good workmanship. Dr. W. F. Howard deals with the Greek, Dr. T. H. Robinson with the Syriac, and the Rev. H. F. D. Sparks with the Latin Bible. Sir William A. Craigie writes on English Versions to Wyclif, Mr. J. Isaacs on 16th Century English Versions (here a little difficult to see the wood for the trees) and the *A.V.* Dr. C. J. Cadoux follows with a useful paper on "The *R.V.* and After", though Walsham How's initials are incorrect and, when care is everywhere taken about titles, it is strange the Rev. R. Mercer Wilson is unfrocked. Special mention should be made of the bibliographies and the full indexes.

The Rev. W. G. Ovens's *The Lord's Supper: Its Abuse and Over-Emphasis* (Church Association, 1s. 6d.) is a Low Church production which conveys a salutary warning, for there are Free Churchmen as well as Anglicans who hold that "the Communion Service is the central service of the Church" and tend "to make an idol of the Sacraments". Mr. Ovens says, and he can scarcely be contradicted:

> We think and talk too much about the Sacraments, too much about the Church; we think too little and speak far too little of Christ. Our desperate need today, not only as a Nation, or even as a Church, but as individuals—fallen, sinful and helpless—is for the omnipotent grace which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

The book discusses sacerdotalism, frequent and fasting Communion, and other aspects of the subject, but its main aim is to show that sacraments are secondary and subsidiary to the Word; in the words of Dr. Charles Brown, which are quoted:

> Salvation by sacraments has no support in the N.T. They are not primary. Men are not saved by their observance; we are saved by faith in Christ and by nothing else.

Christians are very conscious of the vagueness of their thinking about the Holy Spirit, and they will therefore welcome Dr. J. W. Hunkin's *The Spirit of Man and the Spirit of God* (Blackwell, 2s.), three sermons recently preached by the Bishop before the University of Oxford.

Arranged under "The Wars of God", "War as Duty", "War as Problem", "War as Judgment", and "War against War", the Rev. J. R. Coates's *War—What Does the Bible Say?* (Sheldon Press, 1s. 6d.) quotes and discusses the relevant passages.

Dr. W. Graham Scroggie says his *What About Heaven?* (Pickering, 3s. 6d.) is "not a treatise on eschatology, but the meditation of a bereaved heart". It will no doubt provide that "comfort for those in sorrow" the author desires, though many of them will not be able to accept the writer's views—or his spelling of proper names!

Dr. F. Townley Lord's **Conquest of Death* (S.C.M., 6s.) is a great little book which every minister ought to read. He calls it "A Christian Interpretation of Immortality", and it well deserves the title. The ease of Dr. Townley Lord's style must not disguise the fact that there is hard thinking in the book, which can serve both the scholar and the man in the street. Almost every aspect of the subject is surveyed, though we do not remember any mention of re-incarnation, and generally the treatment is thorough and satisfying. We should have liked a little more attention to the case of those, among whom we include ourselves, who have no yearning for personal immortality, who feel that they will reach their best selves if among "those blessed spirits whom God includeth as the sea her waves". But we are grateful to Dr. Lord.

There is no anthology without selections that appeal, and N. G.'s *Testament of Immortality* (Faber, 8s. 6d.), to which Mr. T. S. Eliot furnishes a Foreword, has many of them, selections which will bring comfort and consolation to sorrowing people. Section X. and the Prayers struck us as especially good. Nevertheless, it would have been well if the compiler had had some system in his notes and more care in details: David Starr Jordan is correct on p. 275 but wrongly spelt on p. 59 and in the notes and index, Norman Maclean has lost on p. 113 the "Rev." which he is given on p. 86, and we doubt if Edmund Holmes is right. More important, however, is the arbitrary way in which notes to the writers appear: we are told who F. W. Robertson, Phillips Brooks, and James Hinton were, but not a word is vouchsafed—a test for readers is now coming—about Edward Schneider, Greg, or E. Pieczynska.

Miss Helen M. Barrett's *Boethius* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.) is a competent piece of work which fills a gap. After sketching in the background of Theodoric's reign, Miss Barrett first outlines the part played by Boethius in it, and then discusses the mystery of his fall and execution. An outline of the *Consolation* follows, and an examination of Boethius's treatment of the questions of providence, free will, and eternal life. Miss Barrett's answers to the problem posed by the absence of references to Christianity in the *Consolation* are penetrating. We are glad to note the reference to the dictum of Theodoric quoted by Cassiodorus:

> We cannot give orders about religious belief, since no one can be compelled to believe against his will.

We regret to have to confess that the Dean of Exeter's *Faith in Time of War* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 6s.) brought to mind the sermons the Bishop of London used to deliver at 8.30 in St. Mary's; they generally began, "As I was shaving this morning I was wondering what I should say to you", and young cynics said they sounded like it! The Dean confesses that this book has been written in a hurry, and it fails to represent him at his best. It is an effort to state in time of war the things that cannot be shaken, but it does bear many signs of haste, and the illustrations are trite. We have owed a good deal to Dr. Carpenter's writings in days that are past, and we are sorry not to be able to give a better account of the present one.

Dr. A. Dakin's **Calvinism* is a worthy companion to Dr. A. W. Harrison's *Arminianism* in the Duckworth's Theology Series (5s.). The exposition of the *Institutes*, of which there is a useful analysis in an Appendix, is

especially good; indeed the theological chapters and those on "Some Aspects of Calvinism" are better than the historical, where Dr. Dakin has to cover much ground, on all of which he cannot walk with the confidence of first-hand knowledge. As a whole, however, the book may be commended both to the student and to the general reader. There is a slip in initials on p. 241, and Lord Stamp is not only denied his peerage but on p. 229 becomes "Joshua".

Mr. George R. Preedy's *Life of John Knox* (Jenkins, 15s.) is a dangerous book because it pretends to be unpolemical and unprejudiced. From the early pages, when it accuses Knox of lack of modesty and the self-made man's vanity, to the end, where reference is made to his "life-long obsessions—his spiritual pride and his worldly lust for power", there is nothing objective about Mr. Preedy's methods. Mary of Guise is lauded to the skies; Marjorie Bowes is called "her mother's decoy"; Calvin "had no spiritual gifts and no man was ever less fitted to meddle with the souls of men". Nor does Mr. Preedy manage to paint a consistent picture of any of his characters. We had made a note, "Did anyone ever before call Mary 'discreet'?" when Mr. Preedy suddenly switches over and says Mary shows "a lamentable lack of discretion"; no kind word from her, we are told, was uttered about the galley slaves, and she loved the chase and its butchering, but "her mild and winning manners" won the populace. Mr. Preedy should make up his mind how to spell "appanage" as about greater matters, and, if he wants students to use his books and the ordinary reader not to be misled, he must quiet his animus before he sets pen to paper.

In *The Betrayal of Christ by the Churches* (Dakers, 5s.) Mr. J. Middleton Murry had so good a case that it is a pity he has not made it convincing. The Church has failed Man; therefore it has betrayed Christ. It has been faithless and served Mammon, not God; it is too professional, striving to maintain its own existence rather than to proclaim the good news; it fears to tackle the urgent problems of modern life, and so it has ceased to impress men and now counts for little in the life of the community. So far (and see "Worth Noting") Mr. Murry's contentions are irrefutable; but often his argument wears strangely thin. He lashes himself into a fury about Lord Halifax's Oxford speech, apparently expecting everything in every sermon! Hitler, he maintains, had to choose between communism and intense preparation for war, and if he had chosen communism Germany would have been attacked by Britain and France: Europe has deliberately chosen war because the alternative was socialism. And the way out? Apparently for groups of pacifists now working on the land to form a true and faithful Church; for a "real Christ" who could speak to modern needs

> the Church would have no welcome. It has too much to lose. But we ordinary folk who have nothing to lose could make a Church for him again: for him whom we love, whose lead we can follow, whose love and wisdom we can trust.

Rarely has a book so mingled pertinent criticism and distracted thinking. In practice Mr. Murry's own solution is to join a national Church strong on the institutional side; in theory he forgets that unless his little groups can reach across national barriers, and affect, and infect, governments and peoples in every land the problem of aggression and war remains.

One has only to read such sermons—panegyrics, he calls them—as those Mgr. Ronald Knox, that brilliant pervert, prints in *Captive Flames* (Burns, Oates, 5s.) to understand why Roman Catholicism, despite its boasted conversions, makes such slow progress. Mgr. Knox, no matter

what heights he reaches in the hierarchy, will always be an undergraduate, and his cheeky gibes find a place even in his sermons, pardonably perhaps in describing his hero, Chesterton, but scarcely in dealing with men like Loyola.

England is the promised land; it will never be merry until it becomes "Catholic", and so on and so on: Catholics are not like Puritans, sour and strait-laced and interfering with people's innocent enjoyments; "they are sportsmen like anybody else". We wonder if Mgr. Knox knows anything about Cromwell, Puritanism's "chief of men", and his love of music, sport, and a good horse; why not judge Puritanism by the Protector? Would he like some of the joyless devotees of Romanism, to be found among seculars and regulars and the laity, to be taken as typical? And when he talks of merry Catholic England we must introduce him to Dr. Coulton!

In *The Call of Caldey* (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.) Dom Bede Camm describes the reception into the Roman Church of two Anglican Communities, the monks of Caldey and the nuns of St. Bride's. This took place in 1913, and it is not quite clear why the group conversion is described in such detail at this time of day.

Bibliographers and church historians alike will welcome Professor C. J. Sisson's *The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker and the Birth of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (Cambridge, 10s. 6d.), nearly half of which is occupied with transcripts from records—especially from abstracts of legal proceedings. Professor Sisson argues that the first four books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* were published hurriedly in view of the "Act to retain the Church's subjects in their due obedience", and that their date is 1593, not 1594. He also claims that Walton's account of the marriage of Hooker is unfair to Joan Churchman, that the marriage was "judicious" and happy, and that the story of the destruction of Hooker's manuscripts after his death is a slander on her character. Hooker's marriage may have been judicious—it provided him with financial security—but the evidence for "happiness" is no more than slight. Professor Sisson is perhaps a little too ready to accept facts which fit his theory, as he is to use epithets—where, for example, is the evidence for the "jealous and censorious Travers"? Foxe has lost an "e" on p. 56. On the whole, however, the volume is painstaking and suggestive, though we should like to take up many points in it. The disclosure that new material is to be found in Chancery records will encourage many students.

Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith is always delightful, and his essay, *Milton and His Modern Critics* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.), will give pleasure to all his admirers. No one better than Mr. Smith could have been found to put in their place the midget-detractors of Milton—the Pounds and the Eliots and their like. When these have had their day and ceased to be—even Mr. Eliot, the best of them—Milton will still be like a star, for ever shining.

Had it been written today instead of eighteen years ago, M. Nicolas Berdyaev's *Leontiev* (Bles, 10s. 6d.) would no doubt have called Leontiev the Russian precursor of Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr ("There are very humane men, but no humane States. The *heart* of this or that ruler can be humane; but neither a nation nor a State is a human organism") as well as of Nietzsche and Spengler. Born in 1831 and dying sixty years later, Leontiev was in turn doctor, consul, man of letters, censorship official, and monk. The non-Russian will find it difficult to understand how this self-centred aristocrat, who despised ordinary folk and the ordinary ways of life, deserves all the encomiums the Russian thinker showers upon him. He

was "a solitary spirit, and a man of absolutely unique destiny", "one of the noblest and most moving figures in Russian spiritual life". A transcendental egoist, who "was preoccupied with himself in relation to eternity", he was misunderstood and unpopular in his own time; "he was the first Russian aesthete in an age when Russian thought was essentially social; . . . he foresaw both Communism and Fascism, and predicted the end of an historic epoch, the end of the Russian Empire". In him are to be found "decisive arguments against nationalism and racialism", but he fails in his refusal "to understand the dignity of every human personality as an image and likeness of God".

From all this it may be gathered that this rather repetitive study is not aloof from the problems of today. "Kernal" appears on p. 5, and the usual Russian extravagance is not lacking in Leontiev:

> On that morning . . . I experienced all that men have ever thought about flowers.

The late Mr. E. F. Benson need not have been so diffident about his informal autobiography, *Final Edition* (Longmans, 15s.), for it is as fresh and readable as any of his published work. The Preface, with its illustrations of how memory misleads people—including the present Prime Minister—is one of the most charming and apt of prefaces we have read (an essay on "Prefaces" is indicated some time), and whether he writes of dogs or gardens, London or Cambridge, Capri or Rye, he never fails to be interesting. Perhaps the pages which will attract most attention are those dealing with the family — Maggie, who so sadly lost her mental balance; A.C., with his recurring depressions, his fluent pen, and his fairy godmother from America; and the courageous level-headed mother who bore much but lost faith and courage never. There are some good stories, one or two of the best of which are, unhappily, not tellable in mixed company.

With great interest we have turned over Mr. H. J. Cowell's "pages from a journalist's notebook", *"These Forty Years", 1900-1940* (Baptist Union, 1s.). Mr. Cowell is a convinced Baptist, and his heroes obviously are John Clifford and Dr. Charles Brown—and better ones it would be hard to find. Some of the extracts make sad reading—"Surely our two nations are now joined together for ever" (Marshal Pétain in 1922) and "Anyone who went to Geneva as a sceptic came away soundly converted" (C. B. Fry in 1923). And we wonder how many speeches are recorded saying we are on the eve of a great revival of religion.

One who rejoiced in the friendship of Sir Henry Lunn is naturally interested in his brilliant family, who have long formed one of the finest Mutual Admiration Societies in the country, a Society which, to judge from Mr. Arnold Lunn's *Come What May* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 12s. 6d.), is to continue for another generation, for Arnold is as proud of Peter as Henry was of Arnold. Our biographer has many of his father's qualities, including an egotism which is as disarming as it is delightful: he has not merely revolutionized the art of ski-ing (here he wins unbounded respect for courage in surmounting injuries which would have deterred most people from ever climbing again) and confounded all those who have dared to heckle him in public or in private, but he has routed, among others, such redoubtable antagonists as Profs. Julian Huxley and Cyril Joad, and Mr. H. G. Wells and Mr. Bernard Shaw, to say nothing of Dr. G. G. Coulton, while stories of his prowess in other fields stud his readable and informing pages.

Mr. Lunn's submission to Rome has led him along strange paths. About Spain and Russia he at once "sees Red", and nobody would gather from

his book that German and Italian troops won the victory for Franco, or that Franco's Army were not all holy crusaders for religion. In other ways, too, his new faith has made him strangely blind: consider how the unregenerate Arnold would have ridiculed the religion represented by the Notre Dame questions and answers on pp. 315-318! Minor quarrels with Mr. Lunn are (this is serious) the absence of an Index, the repetition of the phrase "—— is the operative word", and the fact that after several digs at the vagueness of Prof. Huxley's mathematics, he tells us at the beginning of c. XII to skip that chapter and the next and resume at c. XIII. Harrow, Oxford, Switzerland, America, Spain, Italy, the Olympic Games ancient and modern—Mr. Lunn provides embarrassment of riches and much good entertainment.

If *My Life with Grey Owl* (Davies, 8s. 6d.) is, as is claimed, Anahareo's unaided work, she is as skilful with her pen as was Grey Owl himself. Sometimes we have our doubts: "as unpopular as a revivalist at a race-meeting" and one or two similar sentences seem strange for an Indian girl; but maybe she caught them from her husband, and they have become second nature to her. The volume is in part a confession, for Anahareo led Grey Owl a dance and must have sorely taxed his patience ere they parted. Many children came to love Grey Owl, McGinnis and McGinty, Jelly Roll and Rawhide, Anahareo and Dawn: those of older growth will be glad to renew acquaintance with them in these vivid pages.

We are glad that the war has not prevented Mr. E. H. Hayes from bringing out the *Concise Guides* (Religious Education Press) which leaders and teachers in Sunday Schools have found so useful in past years. For 1941 the *Primary, Junior, Intermediate* and *Senior* volumes are 3s. 6d. each (10d. quarterly) and the *Beginners'* and *Morning* volumes 2s. 6d. (7d.). There are also available *Scholars' Papers* (1s. 4d., 4d. quarterly) in four grades, Beginners', Primary, Junior, and Intermediate.

Teachers may also find help in the Independent Press's reprints (1s. 6d.) of three volumes of children's addresses—the Rev. J. W. James's *The Golden Touch,* the Rev. W. Charter Piggott's *That Boy Again!,* and Dr. B. Lee Woolf's nature talks, *A Breath of Fresh Air.* They will also welcome Dr. G. B. Harrison's *More New Tales from the Old Testament* (Nelson, 5s.).

What is to happen when the war ends? Drawing on his long experience with the League of Nations Union, Dr. Maxwell Garnett, in *A Lasting Peace* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), surveys past policies and blunders, and plans for the future. Dr. H. F. Koeppler adds chapters on the basis of German co-operation which find in the Junkers the villains of the peace. The volume is timely, and all who desire that the errors of 1919 should be avoided would do well to ponder it. For a time we wondered what the Greek word "uinon" on p. 13 could be, but it was merely a misprint for "union".

Dr. Norman E. Himes has managed to crowd a great deal into his *Practical Birth-Control Methods* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), although we cannot understand, in view of the spate of books, why he calls this a "lonely" field of research. The book, although it contains nothing new, not only outlines and discusses methods, but it provides a history of contraception and chapters on abortion and sterilization. There are lists of birth-control centres in the United Kingdom and also an International Directory of Societies and Clinics. Havelock Ellis writes a Foreword and Dr. R. L. Dickinson an Introduction.

It is good to meet the Herries family again, even so far back as the spacious days of Queen Elizabeth. The struggle between the Queen and Mary, Queen of Scots, forms the background to Sir Hugh Walpole's *The Bright Pavilions* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.), in which Nicholas Herries, a giant of a man, his brother and his loves, struggle with evil men and in various ways achieve their victory. Another success in a saga which will live.

Yorkshire novelists are to the fore. Winifred Holtby has gone, but Miss Phyllis Bentley and Miss Storm Jameson remain, and now Mr. J. B. Priestley is joined by Mr. Thomas Armstrong, whose long novel, *The Crowthers of Bankdam* (Collins, 9s. 6d.), is a conspicuous success. If it were a film we should suggest that the first pages, descriptive of the county, be cut; half the sentences are not sentences at all, and they add nothing to the book. But when Mr. Armstrong begins to deal with people he handles them in masterly fashion, and his Crowthers are a fine breed—when they run true to type. Mr. Armstrong has brought back to mind many expressions we used to hear in early days; our only quarrel with him is that we do not think Yorkshire ever produced as great a proportion of crooks, or of fools, as his pages suggest: Simeon Crowther and Tom France, however, we have met many a time and oft.

M. Georges Bernanos's *Star of Satan* (Lane, 8s. 6d.), translated from the French, may be wholly intelligible to some readers, but we confess it is beyond us. The study of two pathological types, the young liar-harlot and the flagellant-saint, and of their fight with hallucinations—with the devil if you will—may be case-material for the psychologist and the alienist, but it scarcely makes a novel.

Lancashire Lather (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) contains twenty-four more of Mr. T. Thompson's sketches. Mr. Thompson tells us he is rightly proud of having contributed more short stories to the *Manchester Guardian* than any other writer, and the stories in this volume stand the supreme test of being as amusing on a second reading as they were at first. We feel we know the cronies of Mr. Thompson's barber's shop, while young Winterburn is a masterpiece.

That Mr. Thompson introduces Miss Dora M. Broome's *Lancashire Folks* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) will be a sufficient recommendation for all who know Lancashire and its people. Mr. Thompson himself has done nothing better than these twenty-two sketches.

EDITOR.

Dr. William Ellis's *The Idea of the Soul in Western Philosophy and Science* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is a clever and interesting book by a scientist who has a *flair* for metaphysics. Dr. Ellis feels that not only the soul but metaphysical ideas generally have "worn out their welcome". He has written this book, therefore, to give both an account and a vindication of the idea of the soul, and he has written it not so much for philosophers and scientists as for the ordinary educated man. The first part of his book tells the story of the evolution of the idea of the soul in Greek thought and of its function as a unifying thread running through the whole history of European culture. The second part, which is the more original, deals with what may be called the biological idea of the soul in modern thought. Even here, however, Dr. Ellis cannot quite get away from his Greeks. Plato and Aristotle seem to dominate his own thought very much as they did that of certain ancient Christian writers. In his discussion of subjects like behaviourism, the Entelechy of Driesch, and the limitations of the mechanistic view of the universe Dr. Ellis indicates something of his own position, but we wish he

had made this a little clearer. It is not always possible to see one's way through some of his rather technical discussions, though he does indicate in a cautious and tentative fashion "how a biological concept of life may provide an observational basis for metaphysics". There are some slips in the spelling of Greek words and names which should be corrected in a new edition.

W. B. Selbie.

The Rev. Cullen Young's *Contemporary Ancestors* (Lutterworth Press, 6s.) is written as an introduction to Anthropology for Missionaries and District Officers in Africa. The first part of the book dealing with "Man on the Earth" is rather slight. But it gives an intelligible setting to the *Genesis* narratives in relation to what is now known of pre-historic man. It also avoids the trap which many anthropologists fall into of making too summary deductions from evidence which is at the best incomplete. A student of the subject will do well to use some fuller treatment of it than this first part of Mr. Young's book. The second part is given up to a narrative of the customs and ideas of primitive African races to-day. These are valuable chapters and deal with matters like "Mother-right and Father-right", "Tabu", *etc.* This is the kind of evidence one needs. Mr. Young deals with it out of a first-hand knowledge. But whether these contemporary primitives really are to be identified with early man is after all not easy to decide. There is no doubt this book will greatly help those for whom it is written. It is well done, and very readable.

Mr. C. S. Lewis's **The Problem of Pain* (Centenary Press, 3s. 6d.) is one of the "Christian Challenge" series. It deals with great fairness and frankness with one of the most tormenting of questions. Mr. Lewis sees the universe as one in which pain and suffering cannot be excluded. They have their place and do not represent merely a miscarriage (though partly that), but work to beneficent ends. After all, this is a world in which the "Captain of our Salvation" was made perfect through suffering. There is a penetrating force in that one fact. But what are you to say to men in the throes of pain? Mr. Lewis is helpful because he does not turn his face away from the realities and does not try to be infallible. Perhaps after all has been said the only answer we can give is that we cannot tell; and that in life's dread hours the only thing to do is to fall back on God. In the long run this is Mr. Lewis's working answer no matter what his theory is. And the main value of this very able book is that in the background there is this faith which gives the victory. This is a book of much more than passing interest and of very real worth.

The first two volumes of The Quest Library, *Can we know God?* by the Rev. F. C. Spurr, and *Do you seek Reality?* by Mr. G. Thomson (Lutterworth Press, 2s. each), promise well for the series. They are simply written and should make a wide general appeal. Mr. Spurr's book is an admirable bit of Christian apologetic written with an understanding of present tendencies of thought. Mr. Thomson covers a more scattered field and has a good chapter to finish with on "Christianity and the Modern Mind".

Mr. J. R. Constance's *Tiring of Tongues* (Keyswift, 3s. 3d.) is a collection of poems. Mr. Constance has been a watcher of Nature. His love of Nature comes out in these poems, which have besides an element of quiet in them; this makes them pleasing and helpful in these troubled days.

A. T. S. James.

Although the pieces in Prof. A. N. Wiley's *Rare Prologues and Epilogues 1642-1700* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.) are all reprints, her book must be called original work, for the prologue and epilogue are "treated here for the first time as a literary *genre*".

> Extremely sensitive to the times, prologues and epilogues actually anticipated journalism, having undertaken many of the functions that were performed by newspapers in the eighteenth century.

From a theatrical point of view they represent the last trace of the old intimacy between actor and spectator, thus taking the place of the Elizabethan soliloquy and aside. Prof. Wiley reprints some 44 pieces, providing each with a bibliographical note and a brief introduction. Restoration taste and interests may be studied here in a new and first-hand way.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The vagaries of the post enable us to add another batch of editorial shorter notices.

Women of the Bible (Methuen, 5s.), though it may sell, will not increase Mr. H. V. Morton's reputation. In a slight volume of 170 pages he describes 23 women who "form a feminine picture gallery unmatched in the whole of literature". This may be true, but in many cases the canvases are so worn by time that even Mr. Morton's retouching cannot reproduce the old colours. In other words, Mr. Morton is often making bricks without straw; the woman is sometimes not even so much as a text, but merely a pretext for a description of her environment; thus Lot's wife serves for an account of Sodom and Gomorrah. This does not mean that at times Mr. Morton does not by a suggestive phrase or pen-picture light up a familiar story; he does, for to a knowledge of the literature he has added his own keen observation. "Mr." George Matheson strikes us strangely.

The Archbishop of York's *The Hope of a New World* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) contains six addresses broadcast in the autumn, and five other articles or addresses. The Archbishop, whether one agrees with him or not, is always interesting and suggestive; even if the red of the Don of Queen's is now the palest of pink, some Christians find his talk about the application of the ancient Law of Jubilee to present conditions or about (a much sounder notion) the limitation of profits very alarming. Perhaps the most useful address in the collection is that on "Evangelism in Our Time" (see "Worth Noting"), which we should like to see in the hands of all clergy and ministers. We doubt if board schools ever deserved what the Archbishop says of them: even if it were accurate to say, which we doubt, that "the first board schools were no more than vast boxes of class-rooms", they were probably superior in buildings and in teaching to the majority of the voluntary schools of their day, while by 1902 they were already streets ahead.

With Vol. III, **Church and Society in England from 1880* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) Canon C. E. Hudson and Mr. M. B. Reckitt bring to a conclusion their "materials for the Historical Study of Christian Sociology", entitled *The Church and the World*. The conception and its execution deserve high praise, but this volume, for which Mr. Reckitt is responsible, is the weakest of the three, and largely because it is so "Anglican" in outlook. True, Dissent is mentioned, but there is no indication of the part played by Nonconformist churches in training men in the art of democratic government, of lay preaching, or of the "Nonconformist conscience". It is rare to find a book by a Free Churchman in the authorities quoted (not even Dr. C. J. Cadoux's in the "pacifist" section), while in the contributed Appendix on Education the Church frankly becomes "the Church of Eng-

land". A Free Church collaborator would have helped to give balance and made a successful enterprise into a truly remarkable achievement.

Prof. Denis Saurat's *The Christ at Chartres* (Dent, 4s.) is a difficult book to estimate. From sundry mystical and telepathic experiences which he describes he constructs "a new view of time and creation"; the workmen at Chartres, Blake, and Hugo had a similar vision. Time begins with the conception of Jesus, nine months B.C. Then creation began—and ended, for everything unfolds, backwards and forwards, from that moment. So it comes to pass that

> profound and powerful religious forces are at work in the soul of France, under the surface of mixed Catholicism and materialism. Probably the real soul of France belongs, deeply, to neither of these official schools, but has a dark and secret life of its own. Perhaps a religious regeneration of the French will come from stranger sources than we have yet dreamt of.

In the *Transactions* of the Congregational Historical Society will be found a long review of Prof. R. P. Stearns's *Congregationalism in the Dutch Netherlands* (American Society of Church History, $3.00), which tells the story of "The Rise and Fall of the English Congregational Classis, 1621-1635". "Congregational Classis" seems a contradiction in terms, but the whole episode is packed with anomalies. That Puritans exiled from England for their religion should petition the King for permission to form a Classis is strange enough, and some of the ministers (possibly John Robinson himself, though he is only mentioned in a footnote) declined to enter it. With all shades of opinion represented, with loyalties, often conflicting, to the King, the States General, the Merchant Adventurers, and their own consciences, the members of the Classis were in an impossible position, and when Laud saw to it that pressure was put on the States General, the association was dissolved. Prof. Stearns prints many of Ambassador Boswell's MSS. (in the British Museum), but most had previously seen the light in Burrage. He contributes little that is new, and there are regrettable signs of bias, but it is good to see a new worker in this field.

Though the interests of Misses M. C. Bradbrook and M. G. Lloyd Thomas are literary rather than historical or biographical they have managed to provide a useful biography in *Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.). They see in their subject "a mind so equable and stable that the poems appear to be its natural flowering" and place him suggestively as a link between Donne and Swift. We wonder why a military verb is not "strictly proper" in a Puritan poem (shades of the Ironsides!), and Girton should really know how to spell "repentance" (no, it isn't a misprint for it appears twice). How fortunate for Mr. Lloyd George that Samuel Parker did not persuade Parliament to pass an Act "to abridge the use of fulsom and lushious Metaphors"!

In *Coleridge Fille* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.) Prof. E. L. Griggs, who has done such sterling work on Hartley Coleridge, turns to his sister, the beautiful blue-stocking Sara, who made it her mission in life to put her wayward father's literary house in order. This is a model biography—well-documented, not too long, sympathetic and yet discriminating, and very readable. Prof. Griggs uses "visit" in the American and not the English sense on p. 238, but this is the only criticism we have to offer on a well-informed and able study.

Brass Chandelier (Allen & Unwin, 15s.) is a biography of R. H. Best, a Birmingham business man, by his son, Mr. R. D. Best. Prof. Sargant

Florence rightly welcomes the book as of importance for economists; it shows from the inside the methods and the vicissitudes of a business in Victorian England. All kinds of points of interest arise, among them the relations of capital and labour, and the changes consequent upon the discovery of the incandescent lamp and of electricity. Best, as might be imagined, followed Joseph Chamberlain in becoming a Tariff Reformer, but he maintained to the end of his life the social passion which seemed to recede in Chamberlain's case; he was a great believer in Continuation Schools (here his travels on the Continent helped him) and Adult Schools (he wanted the Adult School Union to run a reformed public-house). Altogether he was a respected and respectable business man with a sense of social responsibility. We trust the type will not die out. Incidentally there is an unfamiliar story of John Angell James—related on the authority of John Bragg's unpublished memoirs—who is said to have sent the Carrs Lane congregation into a panic by having a man outside the meeting-house to blow a bugle to illustrate a sermon on "The Last Trump".

LECTURES AND PAMPHLETS.

THE war seems to have increased rather than diminished the immense amount of pamphlet literature, and we cannot even mention all that has come to hand. Of that directly concerned with the War, the Oxford Pamphlets (3d.) maintain a high standard. Then we have the Czech National Committee's *German Cultural Oppression in Czechoslovakia*, Dr. Benes's *Nazi Barbarism in Czechoslovakia* (Allen & Unwin, 6d. each), and Prof. Denis Saurat's *Regeneration* (Dent, 1s.).

Bishop Winnington-Ingram writes *A Second Day of God* (Longmans, 1s.) and his successor prefaces Bishop Walter Carey's handy *ABC of the Christian Religion* (Eyre, 1s.). Women will welcome Mrs. Feeney's talks, *Women in War-time* (Indep. Press, 6d.), after which the Rev. J. S. Clarke's addresses to sailors, *Dog Watch Dogma* (Hodder, 6d.), seems appropriate. Admirable broadcast talks are Dr. A. D. Lindsay's *Our Duty to God and to the State* (Lutterworth Press, 9d.) and Dr. T. W. Manson's *God and the Nations* (S.C.M., 1s.). *The Place of Nationalism in Religion* (Seabury-Western Seminary) is the Archbishop of Brisbane's Hale Memorial Sermon.

ALSO RECEIVED.

T. J. HARDY. *How I Came to Acknowledge The Pope.* Burns, Oates. 1s.

W. GRAHAM SCROGGIE. *Know Your Bible.* Analytical. Vol. II. The New Testament. Pickering. 8s. 6d.

God Signs His Name. God's Troubadour. These "Wayside Books" (Epworth Press, 1s. 3d.) are "Gleanings" from the devotional writings of Robertson Nicoll and the poems of George MacDonald compiled by the Rev. H. Escott, who has contributed to our pages.

Seas of the Moon. Friends' Book Centre. 2s. These anonymous "musings in old age" are unusual both in text and the selected quotations.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (Oct.). The President of the Conference opens on "The Great O's of Advent", the Rev. H. S. Darby has an informing article on "The English Pulpit", Dr. O. A. Beckerlegge a learned article on "John Wesley and the German Hymns". Dr. Garvie is another contributor; to what periodical does he not contribute?

The Hibbert Journal (Oct.). A varied and stimulating number. Appreciations of Sir Oliver Lodge and Alfred Loisy are followed by articles from Dr. C. J. Wright,

Dr. Garvie, Prof. R. B. Mowat, the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, Sir Richard Livingstone, Dr. F. J. C. Hearnshaw ("Is Christianity committed to Pacifism?"), and others. Prof. Dawes-Hicks surveys philosophical literature.

The Baptist Quarterly (Oct.). Prof. H. H. Rowley discusses "The Changing Emphasis in Biblical Studies" and Mr. S. J. Price "Maze Pond and the Matterhorn" (Edward Whymper); historical articles deal with the Broadmead Records and the Wall Memorials of Battersea Chapel.

The Modern Churchman (Oct. and Nov.). The October number includes six of the papers which would have been read at the Modern Churchmen's Conference. Among the contributors are Canon Anson, Dr. A. C. Bouquet, the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, the Rev. T. Wigley, and Mr. Guy Kendall. Mr. R. B. Henderson on "Religion and Education" is refreshing as usual.

The Evangelical Quarterly (Oct.). Principal Curr writes on "The Two Testaments" and Prof. G. D. Henderson on "Religion and Democracy in Scottish History"; other articles deal with the Scriptures, and there are some reviews.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (10th Month). The initials "G.N." do not conceal the writer of the appreciation of H. A. L. Fisher. Dr. H. G. Wood discusses "Friends and the Creeds" and Mr. E. E. Taylor "A Retreat of the Publishers of Truth". Elizabeth Fox Howard contributes interesting "Memories of a Suburban Childhood".

The Expository Times (Oct.-Dec.). Dr. D. S. Cairns's "Some Thoughts on the Atonement" and Prof. John Foster's "The Historic Church and Present Need" should be read, and also the articles by Profs. J. G. Riddell, F. R. Tennant, and Dr. W. S. Urquhart. We are glad to note a contribution from the Rev. E. C. Blackman, of Cheshunt College.

The International Review of Missions (Oct.). Dr. K. S. Latourette's "Indigenous Christianity in the Light of History" is valuable, and specially welcome is the Rev. Douglas James's "The Contribution of Campbell N. Moody to Missionary Thinking". India, Africa, the West Indies, and Japan are the subjects of other articles.

World Dominion (Nov.-Dec.). "Observer" opens with "Whither Japan?", and thence we proceed on a survey round the globe, the missionary articles being interspersed by "The Cell Method of Growth" and a doctor's "The Spiritual in Therapy".

Religion in Education. Dr. N. Micklem discusses "The Christian Doctrine of Man", Prof. Victor Murray "Education and a New Order", and Canon Prideaux "The Bible as a Handbook of Citizenship". Dr. Pu Hwang's "Whither the Christian Colleges in China?" is important.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (Oct.). The Editor has a commemoration article on the 500th anniversary of the invention of printing, and also reprints his *Spectator* article, "Twice-Raped Louvain". Dr. F. Taylor describes manuscript collections and Dr. H. H. Rowley writes on "The Chinese Sages and the Golden Rule". The other articles cover a wide range, though the medieval period gets more than its share. Dr. Edward Robertson's "Early Navigation: Its Extent and Importance" is a learned study.

Religion in Life (Autumn). This American quarterly maintains its standard. Of its fourteen articles we can only mention Prof. H. N. Kerr's "The Theological Seminaries and the Ecumenical Movement", Prof. Georgia Harkness's "Nature as the Vehicle of Grace", and Dr. D. A. Poling's "The Christian Home in a Warlike World". Prof. D. E. Roberts's "A Christian View of Freedom" refuses to go unnoticed.

Anglican Theological Review (Oct.). There are three articles on the Presbyterian-Episcopalian Concordat. Other contributions deal with "Missions and Christian Disunion", the chronology of the Passion, and the philosophy of the State. We should like to see a little more of the Editors, whose pages are always worth while.

Theological Studies (Sep.). This is No. 3 of an American Jesuit quarterly. It opens with Father E. L. Murphy's "Church Unity and Protestant Missions", and there follow articles on "The Elevation of the Host" (historical) and "The God of Egypt's Wise Men". There are nearly 70 pp. of book reviews.

Review and Expositor (Oct.). Historical students will be grateful for Dr. W. T. Whitley's "The Start of Baptist Periodicals". "Facing Pastoral Problems" this time is "A Suggested Course of Reading for the Person-Minded Minister". The opening article is Dr. G. C. Humphreys's "The Righteousness of God a Redemptive Quality".

CORRESPONDENCE

AN EXPOSITORY DICTIONARY OF N.T. WORDS

Mr. W. E. Vine, the author, writes:

The review in the *Congregational Quarterly* (July, p. 338) really requires reconsideration in several respects.

(1) This Dictionary is not simply "for students with no knowledge of Greek". The reviewer does not seem to have read the Preface to Vol. III, par. 2! Only the other day I had a letter from a brilliant classical scholar saying how greatly he had been helped by this work.

(2) The student without a knowledge of Greek will not "find the information herein easily obtainable from concordances and commentaries". What would he do in endeavouring to use Moulton and Milligan's *Vocab. of the Greek Papyri*, from which I have culled a large number of details? Those volumes would be *Greek* to him. These and other similar works of which I have made use, several of which contain much Greek material, would be practically of no use to such students. Again, what about the large volumes of Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*? It would be rather cumbersome for a student to handle these volumes, perhaps at a library. Further, for them to have recourse to a considerable number of works to gain the information in what I have produced would involve much waste of time.

(3) Regarding the presentation of synonymous words (only one, though a prominent, feature of the work), a correspondent, widely-read and thoroughly competent to express an opinion, has written to say that he knows of no other work like it.

(4) As to the remark that "it is difficult to see the value of such a work", the reviewer's difficulty would be speedily dissipated were he to see the very considerable number of letters (they are constantly being received) testifying to help obtained; these letters include several from missionaries who are engaged in translation work; a large number are from Bible students.

I venture to suggest that the reviewer might reconsider his criticisms, and provide readers of the *Congregational Quarterly* with something more nearly approximating to facts.

W. E. VINE.

Our reviewer replies:

1. Credit was given in the review to the "able scholarship" of the author and the "useful information" provided by the book.

2. As the review concerned Vol. 2, I was (and am) ignorant of the contents of the Preface to Vol. III, par. 2.

3. My own feeling is that the book falls between two stools. I am relieved to find that the author's experience is that he has hit two birds with one stone.

A. J. GRIEVE.

MR. INGRAM'S *SEX-MORALITY TOMORROW*.

Dear Sir,

I have read the *Congregational Quarterly* since its first issue and nearly always with pleasure and profit, but I confess that an editorial paragraph in the current number somewhat staggers me.

In a review of Mr. Kenneth Ingram's *Sex-Morality Tomorrow*—which I have not seen—the author writes, "If the love is mutual and the desire for consummation is mutual, on what moral principle, as distinct

from legalistic regulations, can the act be evil?"—to which you, sir, add: "It remains for those who take the orthodox view to provide a satisfying answer".

Presumably, Mr. Ingram refers to conduct out of wedlock, in which case he can only include (1) unmarried folk or (2) people who are not married to each other. As to (1) the New Testament (I will make no reference to the Old) speaks of this action as "fornication" and does not deal with it gently in its twenty references, and as to (2) refers to the action as "adultery" with no less vehemence in its twelve condemnations of the act. Clearly, therefore, the writer does not accept the Scriptures as a reliable guide on these matters.

Can the Bible be accepted as a trustworthy mentor on the subject? I think it can. Physical desire—as distinct from love—out of the married state is one full of peril to those who practise it. There will be agreement as to the dangers in (2), so we may confine ourselves to (1).

First, let it be admitted that the sex impulse is one of the most powerful in human life; possibly only the appetite of physical hunger is more dominant. It can become devastating unless rigidly controlled. Unless also it is consummated with a spiritual background to it, it is unsatisfying and often becomes degrading. At its best (as in a happy married life) it is the supreme ecstasy of two lives that have become dedicated to each other "till death do them part". The Creator has, for his own purposes, sanctified our animal nature in wedlock and made it spiritual. Not so, however, in a fugitive "love impulse". Behind that there is no vow to create new life with all of the sacred implications of that great adventure (indeed, such an event would be generally regarded as an unsought embarrassment). There is nothing more in it finally than the gratification of an uncontrolled desire.

It is said that personality is only the sum total of thought, impulse, and experience; illicit love leaves scars on our character which often play havoc with our higher instincts. For that reason Christianity teaches, what medicine generally confirms, that the sex act must be jealously guarded till it becomes the final surrender of married love.

This attitude to the problem creates its own formidable difficulties which are so well known that I need not enlarge upon them. None the less, any man would say out of a long life's experience that he rejoiced that God gave him the strength to live a continent life till he was able to give his whole-hearted love to his own wife unsullied by other fugitive amours which he would now be ashamed to recall when the heats of nature are burning low.

Mr. Ingram uses the terms "love" and "desire" as if they were interchangeable but they are not. "Desire" is a physical attribute (but none the less good because of that, since it is God-created), but its roots are grounded in selfishness and uncontrolled desire, its fruits are rape, murder, jealousy, cruelty, hate and violence. "Love" is a spiritual quality and its fruits always unselfish. It "seeks not its own", it "never faileth", but "desire" is transitory and "vanisheth away". Unless the physical is dominated by the spiritual it is impermanent and often finally destructive. What man with any knowledge of life would not say that this fact is confirmed by all his experience?

All of this is manifest when it is remembered that life is a constant warfare between the flesh and the spirit, and that the great enemy of spiritual discernment is the domination of the bodily instincts. Religion reveals to us the way of life, which is, through the help of God, to become masters over the desires of our physical nature. In life there is no room for a divided loyalty.

Do I then assert that strict continence is the path of wisdom apart from the married state? Unquestionably. Ungratified appetite gradually sub-

sides, and becomes more easily controlled as time passes, but once gratified is not readily disciplined. To those who find their instincts difficult to control, suitable diet, hard exercise, abstinence from stimulants, and "sublimation" in other interests are all valuable. Bachelors and spinsters are only doing what the worker bee does as a matter of course, in loyalty to the life of the hive.

But marriage is to the most of us the wise solution, if we are ready to simplify life and live unselfishly, and in that we will gradually learn the discipline of love. Till that consummation is reached, we must keep a guard on our souls, and see to it that evil desires are not resisted (that is dangerous) but replaced by healthy active thought.

The Christian teaching on this subject is not optional—it is vital and it is in harmony with true scientific and psychological thought of the present time. To deny this seems to me to run counter to all ascertained fact, and to invite our young manhood and womanhood to sell their birthright tor a mess of pottage. Do you not agree?

Sometimes I wonder whether we do not so boast as Free Churchmen of our liberty as to forget that all freedom is based on self-discipline without which we are slaves indeed.

What I have written has been generally accepted by Christians throughout the ages, but this age seems to be in danger of forgetting it. Let us learn to pray again Jeremy Taylor's prayer:—

> O Eternal God, sanctify my body and soul, my thoughts and my intentions, my words and actions, that whatsoever I shall think, or speak or do, may be by me designed for the glorification of Thy Name, and, by Thy blessing, it may be effective and successful in the work of God, according as it can be capable. Lord, turn my necessities into virtue; the works of nature into the works of grace; by making them orderly, regular, temperate; and let no pride or self-seeking, no covetousness or revenge, no little ends and low imaginations, pollute my spirit, and unhallow any of my words and actions; but let my body be a servant of my spirit, and both body and spirit servants of Jesus; that, doing all things for Thy glory here, I may be partaker of Thy glory hereafter, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Faithfully Yours,
ANGUS WATSON.